



SCHOOL of
GRADUATE STUDIES
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University
**Digital Commons @ East
Tennessee State University**

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

December 1974

A Preservice And/Or Inservice Training Program for Board of Education Members

Charles E. Calloway

East Tennessee State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Calloway, Charles E., "A Preservice And/Or Inservice Training Program for Board of Education Members" (1974). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 2841. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/2841>

This Dissertation - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact digilib@etsu.edu.

75-9491

CALLOWAY, Charles Edgar, 1947-
A PRESERVICE AND/OR INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM
FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS.

East Tennessee State University, Ed.D., 1974
Education, general

Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

© 1975

CHARLES EDGAR CALLOWAY

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

A PRESERVICE AND/OR INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM
FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Education
East Tennessee State University

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education

by
Charles E. Calloway

December 1974

APPROVAL

This is to certify that the Advanced Graduate Committee of

Charles Edgar Calloway, Jr.

met on the

25th day of November, 19 74.

The committee read and examined his dissertation, supervised his defense of it in an oral examination and decided to recommend that his study be submitted to the Graduate Council and the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Doctor of Education.

Robert G. Shepard
Chairman, Advanced Graduate Committee

Clyde L. Orr

Charles W. Burkett

Ralph W. Clarke

Donald R. Pool

Elizabeth L. McMahon
Dean, School of Graduate Studies

**A PRESERVICE AND/OR INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM
FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS**

**An Abstract
Presented to
the Graduate Faculty
East Tennessee State University**

**In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Education**

**by
Charles E. Calloway**

December 1974

Charles E. Calloway, B. S., Union College, June 1969.
M. A., Union College, August 1970.
Ed.D., East Tennessee State University,
December 1974.

A PRESERVICE AND/OR INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM
FOR BOARD OF EDUCATION MEMBERS

Purpose. The purpose of this study was to develop a preservice training program for prospective board of education members, and one that would be of appropriate use by board members already serving.

Method. Current issues of indexes and other guides to sources of literature were read in search of titles pertaining to the problem of the study as well as to the questions. The guides to Dissertation Abstracts, Educational Research Information Center (ERIC), Current Index to Journals of Education (CIJE), Education Index, and the card catalog were closely scrutinized. Appropriate papers, articles, and books were read for possible inclusion in the study. Notes were taken from those sources containing data which appeared useful. These notes were separated into major categories, and decisions were made as to which materials to include in the study. This was followed by a computer search of ERIC, DATRIX (a search service of Dissertation Abstracts), and SRIS (a search service provided by the Phi Delta Kappa Research Service Center).

Letters were sent to the state school boards associations and the state departments of education in Tennessee and Tennessee's eight bordering states requesting information concerning qualifications for school board members as well as information concerning preservice and inservice training programs for school board members. Information concerning activities that should be included in such a program was also sought.

A survey of school board training practices in Tennessee was conducted. This was accomplished by means of a Questionnaire constructed by this investigator and mailed to the chairmen of the school boards in the 146 school systems of Tennessee, the superintendents of each of these systems, and one board member other than the chairman, randomly chosen from each school system.

After all the data had been collected and analyzed, a comprehensive preservice training program for prospective board members was developed based on the data found. The program was also developed with the intention of serving as an inservice program for presently serving board members.

Once the school board training program was developed, it was field tested for effectiveness. The field testing situation involved a number of school board members and prospective school board members from the East Tennessee area.

Summary. The problem of this study was to develop a preservice training program for prospective board of education members. The program was also developed so as to be of use by board members already serving. More specifically, the major objectives of the study were: (1) to determine if Tennessee and Tennessee's bordering states have preservice or inservice training programs for school board members; (2) to determine the qualifications for serving as a school board member in Tennessee and in Tennessee's bordering states; (3) to determine if some type of preservice training program should be required of all prospective school board members; (4) to determine the types of activities a school board member should be familiar with before assuming his job; (5) to determine what a preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members should consist of and based on these needs to develop such a training program; and (6) to field test the preservice and/or inservice training program with a group of school board members and prospective school board members.

Conclusions. Based upon the findings of the study, it was concluded that: (1) there had been practically no research dealing directly with preservice training for school board members; (2) there was very little formal, organized training for school board members in the state of Tennessee; (3) superintendents, board chairmen, and selected board members desired and believed that there should be better training of board members in Tennessee; (4) Tennessee's border states varied widely in their efforts to train school board members for their jobs; (5) board members should not be required to take part in a training program either before or after election or appointment; there was a need for more board member training in the state of Tennessee; (6) the preservice and/or inservice training program developed could help board members and prospective board members to become better versed and more learned in those areas and competencies needed to become an effective board member; and (7) those persons involved in the education process in Tennessee and in Tennessee's border states were interested in seeing the quality of school boardmanship upgraded.

.

Dissertation prepared under the guidance of Dr. Robert G. Shepard, Dr. Clyde L. Orr, Dr. Charles W. Burkett, Dr. Ralph W. Clarke, and Dr. Donald H. Poole.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to the following: Dr. Robert Shepard, his committee chairman and dissertation director for his help, guidance, and friendship; and Dr. Clyde Orr, Dr. Charles Burkett, Dr. Ralph Clarke, and Dr. Donald Poole for serving as committee members and for their guidance and encouragement during the study.

To his wife Whitcomb, the writer is indebted for her patience, understanding, and encouragement throughout the doctoral program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	viii
 Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
THE PROBLEM	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Subproblems	2
Significance of the Study	2
Limitations of the Study	4
Assumptions	5
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS	6
PROCEDURES	9
QUESTIONS RELEVANT TO STUDY	11
ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY	11
2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	13
INTRODUCTION	13
QUALITIES OF THE EFFECTIVE BOARD MEMBER	14
HOW A NEW BOARD MEMBER CAN PREPARE HIMSELF FOR HIS NEW JOB	16
INFORMING SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS	18
THE TENNESSEE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION	20
SCHOOL BOARD TRAINING PROCEDURES	23
THE FUTURE	41

Chapter	Page
3. PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY	44
RELATED LITERATURE	45
INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM LETTERS PERTAINING TO QUALIFICATIONS AND TRAINING PROGRAMS	46
SELECTION OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS AND SUBJECTS	46
CONSTRUCTION OF THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT	47
PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING DATA	49
EVALUATION OF DATA	50
DEVELOPING THE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS	50
FIELD TESTING THE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS	52
SUMMARY	52
4. DATA AND FINDINGS	54
SCHOOL SYSTEMS INVOLVED IN STUDY	55
QUESTIONNAIRE TO SUPERINTENDENTS, BOARD CHAIRMEN, AND SELECTED BOARD MEMBERS	55
STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION AND STATE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATIONS INVOLVED IN STUDY	93
LETTERS TO STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION AND STATE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATIONS	95
QUESTIONS TESTED FOR THE STUDY	123
Question Number One	123
Question Number Two	123
Question Number Three	128
Question Number Four	135
Question Number Five	139
Question Number Six	154
Question Number Seven	155

Chapter

Page

Question Number Eight	155
5. A RECOMMENDED TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS: PRESERVICE AND/OR INSERVICE	156
PRIMARY AREAS OF CONCERN BY THE SUPERINTENDENT	157
A PRESERVICE AND/OR INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS	176
RESULTS OF THE FIELD TESTING SITUATION	224
6. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY	240
SUMMARY	240
CONCLUSIONS	242
IMPLICATIONS	245
RECOMMENDATIONS	247
BIBLIOGRAPHY	249
APPENDIXES	254
A. COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE TO SUPERINTENDENTS, BOARD CHAIRMEN, AND SELECTED BOARD MEMBERS	255
B. FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO QUESTIONNAIRE	260
C. LETTER OF INQUIRY TO STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND STATE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION	262
D. FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO LETTER OF INQUIRY	264
E. LETTER OF INVITATION TO WORKSHOP	266
F. NOTICE TO SUPERINTENDENTS EXPLAINING WORKSHOP	268
G. LETTER TO RADIO AND TELEVISION STATIONS	270
H. LETTER TO NEWSPAPERS	272
I. WORKSHOP ANNOUNCEMENTS PLACED IN EDUCATION BUILDING	274

Chapter

Page

J. WORKSHOP SCHEDULE	276
K. PRETEST	278
L. POSTTEST	287
M. ORAL REMARKS ABOUT WORKSHOP VOICED BY WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS	297

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number and Percentage of Questionnaires Completed and Returned	57
2. Number and Percent of the 394 Questionnaires Returned That Were Completed by Superintendents, Board Chairmen, and Selected Board Members	56
3. Do You Feel Board Members in Your System Should Receive Better Orientation for Their Jobs?	59
4. Where Do You Feel a Board Member Orientation Program Should Be Held?	60
5. By Whom Do You Feel the Board Member Orientation Program Should Be Conducted?	63
6. What Type of Speakers Should Be Used in a Board Member Orientation Program?	65
7. When Do You Feel the Board Member Orientation Program Should Be Offered?	67
8. How Long Should the Board Member Orientation Program Last?	68
9. Number and Percent of First Place Voters Only on Question 7 of Questionnaire	71
10. Ranking of Topics When All Votes Were Considered on Question 7 of Questionnaire	72
11. Does Your School System Have Orientation Programs for New School Board Members?	74
12. Is Your School System's Orientation Program for School Board Members Considered Comprehensive or Less Than That?	75

Table

Page

13.	Number and Percent of the 111 Persons Answering Question 10 of the Questionnaire Who Responded to Part A Entitled "Reading Materials"	80
14.	Number and Percent of Respondents Answering Question 10B of Questionnaire Which Was Entitled "a Private Conference in Which Problems and Issues Are Covered"	83
15.	Number and Percent of Respondents Answering Question 10C of Questionnaire Which Was Entitled "Visits to the School System's Offices and Schools"	84
16.	Number and Percent of Respondents Answering Question 10D of Questionnaire Which Was Entitled "a Letter of Welcome and Congratulations"	86
17.	When Does the New Board Member Receive His Orientation (if Your School System Has Such a Program)?	88
18.	Who Carries Out the Orientation of the New Board Member (if Your School System Has an Orientation Program)?	90
19.	Do You Feel That Some Type of Preservice Orientation Program Should Be Required of All Prospective School Board Members?	91
20.	Contradictions Revealed by Questionnaire Between What the Respondents Felt Should Be and What Actually Existed	94
21.	Information Concerning Tennessee Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State Department of Education and State School Boards Association	97
22.	Information Concerning Alabama Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State Department of Education and State School Boards Association	100

Table

Page

23.	Information Concerning Arkansas Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State Department of Education and State School Boards Association	103
24.	Information Concerning Georgia Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State Department of Education and State School Boards Association	107
25.	Information Concerning Kentucky Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State Department of Education and State School Boards Association	110
26.	Information Concerning Mississippi Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State Department of Education and State School Boards Association	113
27.	Information Concerning Missouri Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State Department of Education and State School Boards Association	115
28.	Information Concerning North Carolina Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State Department of Education and State School Boards Association	120
29.	Information Concerning Virginia Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State Department of Education and State School Boards Association	122
30.	Qualifications for Serving As a Board Member in Tennessee and in Tennessee's Eight Border States	124
31.	Preservice or Inservice Training Programs in Tennessee and in Tennessee's Eight Border States	129
32.	Activities a Prospective Board Member Should Be Familiar With Based on the Searches of the Literature and the Survey of Tennessee's School Systems	140
33.	Factors State Departments of Education Felt Prospective School Board Members Should Be Familiar With Before Assuming Job	143

Table

Page

34. Factors State School Boards Associations Felt Prospective School Board Members Should Be Familiar With Before Assuming Job	146
35. Television Stations Announcing Workshop	226
36. Radio Stations Announcing Workshop	226
37. Newspapers Announcing Workshop	227
38. Workshop Participants	228
39. Pretest Scores and Posttest Scores	235
40. Number and Percent of Changed Scores Between Pretest and Posttest	234
41. Variance, Standard Deviation, and Mean for Pretest and Posttest	236
42. The t-Test of Significance	237
43. Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient	239

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Are new school board members adequately prepared to assume their duties? Unfortunately, the majority of new school board members are not fully aware of their new responsibilities, because very few school districts put forth an honest effort where orientation programs for new or prespective board members are concerned.

If it is agreed that some sort of orientation program is needed for new or prospective board members, then the obvious question arises as to what orientation these persons will receive. Such a program should be developed to provide the new member with sufficient basic information to enable him to make a reasonable assessment of proposals that come before the board.

One might go so far as to assume that the increasing complexity of problems facing boards of education today, along with the ever-growing amounts of money with which they are entrusted, demands a training program for new and prospective board members. Presumably, presently serving board members would not be harmed by being exposed to such a program. Although a preservice and inservice training program will not solve all the problems, it appears to be the best answer available.

THE PROBLEM

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to develop a preservice training

program for prospective board of education members and one that would be of appropriate use by board members already serving.

Subproblems

The problem was divided into components in order to facilitate the identification of the many aspects involved. The subproblems were:

1. To determine if Tennessee and Tennessee's bordering states have preservice or inservice training programs for school board members.
2. To determine the qualifications for serving as a school board member in Tennessee and in Tennessee's bordering states.
3. To determine if some type of preservice training program should be required of all prospective school board members.
4. To determine the types of activities a school board member should be familiar with before assuming his job.
5. To determine what a preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members should consist of and based on these needs to develop such a training program.
6. To field test the preservice and/or inservice training program with a group of school board members and prospective school board members.

Significance of the Study

Until a few years ago, a board of education and a professional staff faced few restrictions as far as the administering of a school system was concerned, often doing solely as they pleased. The public rarely questioned the board or the educators about such things as how their money was being spent or how their children were being taught. This is no longer true; a new era has begun. Some use the phrase "the age of accountability" to describe it.

Most educators have always felt they were both accountable and responsible for the things they did. The big difference now is that the public is no longer satisfied to entrust their children and their money to other people who have no knowledge whatsoever of what is happening to these human resources. Board members and educators are being asked more and more frequently to explain why they did or did not do something and, then, are held personally responsible for their courses of action. As a result, the older practice of permitting the superintendent of schools and possibly the chairman of the board to direct activities with the rest of the board acting as a rubber stamp is fast disappearing in many areas. More and more board members today realize their large responsibility to the people, especially to the children of their district, and they also realize that there is no way, short of resigning, by which they can shift this burden to someone else. Herein the problem arises. Simply because a person has a big job to do does not mean he is adequately prepared to handle it. Unfortunately, this is the case with most board members. Generally, they are not elected because they have the necessary background to do a good job. Too often they are totally unprepared to assume their duties. They know practically nothing about their local school system and even less concerning such things as school finance and curriculum. In other words, they are lost. According to Marie S. Ruys, President of the Board of Education in Kimberly, Wisconsin, what newcomers need but rarely get is a course in effective boardmanship. She went on to say that the reason such a program is nonexistent in most places is time, money, and unavailability.¹ Time and money always seem to be problems, but

¹Marie S. Ruys, "Could You Be a Better Board Member Than You Are?" The American School Board Journal, 160:38, August, 1973.

if the need is great enough, both adequate time and finances usually can be found. There is no excuse for the third reason, unavailability, for not having a training program for board members. It was the excuse most often given by school board associations and educators across the country when stating reasons as to why they do not have such a training program. Here lies the major significance of this study. Practically all board members and professional educators agree that there is a need for a preservice training program for prospective board members or an inservice training program for new board members. The problem is that there are just too few, if any, adequate programs of this nature in existence. The development of such a training program will mean a great deal to individual board members who feel inadequate in their jobs. Of even greater importance will be the benefits the school system, and ultimately the children, will receive as a result of having better informed and more knowledgeable board of education members.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this study were as follows:

1. The background research for the study was limited to a survey of the literature pertaining to the subject and to the collection of data and information from the state school board associations and state departments of education in Tennessee and in Tennessee's eight bordering states.
2. The survey of school board training practices in Tennessee was limited to data gathered through a Questionnaire completed by the chairmen of the school boards in the 146 school systems of Tennessee, the superintendents of each of these systems, and one board member other

than the chairman from each school system. The latter subjects were chosen at random from each school system. A 70 percent return was considered acceptable.

3. This study was limited to the development of a preservice training program for prospective board of education members and/or an inservice training program for board of education members already serving.

4. The field testing of the training program was limited to a workshop of four and one-half hours duration which was open to all board members and prospective board members in the East Tennessee area.

Assumptions

The following assumptions were considered pertinent to this study:

1. A need exists for a preservice and/or inservice training program for board of education members.

2. It would be possible to develop a training program for board of education members that would help them to do a better job.

3. The necessary components for such a program could be found through a survey of the relevant literature, through information obtained from state boards of education and state departments of education, and through a survey of the 146 school systems in the state of Tennessee.

4. The school superintendents, board chairmen, and regular board members would be unbiased in their answers.

5. The board chairmen were likely to have greater experience in school board matters than the other board members.

6. All questions stated in the study could be answered to a

reasonable degree.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Accountability

Obligated to account for or be responsible for one's acts.²

Agenda

A list or outline of things to be done, subjects to be discussed, or business to be transacted.³

Board of Education

The school district agency created by the state, but generally popularly elected, on which the statutes of the state or commonwealth place the responsibility for conducting the local public education systems.⁴

Board Policy

A judgment, derived from some system of values and some assessment of situational factors, operating within institutionalized education as a general plan for guiding decisions regarding means of attaining educational objectives.⁵

²David B. Guralnik, ed., Webster's New World Dictionary (New York: World Publishing, 1970).

³Philip B. Gove, ed., Webster's Third New International Dictionary (Springfield, Massachusetts: G. and C. Merriam, 1967).

⁴Carter V. Good, ed., Dictionary of Education (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959).

⁵Ibid.

Clinic

A class, session, or group meeting devoted to the presentation, analysis, and treatment or solution of actual cases and concrete problems in some special field or discipline.⁶

Conference

A meeting for consultation, discussion, or an interchange of opinions whether of individuals or groups.⁷

Convention

A body or assembly of persons met for some common purpose.⁸

DATRIX

DATRIX, Direct Access To Reference Information - a Xerox service, is a computerized information retrieval system for quick and easy access to dissertations published by University Microfilms.⁹

ERIC

ERIC is the Educational Resources Information Center. The Center collects and disseminates the vast body of literature on change in curricula, in educational media, and in teaching methods.¹⁰

Field Testing

Evaluation under realistic conditions for the purpose of

⁶Gove, op. cit.

⁷Gove, op. cit.

⁸Gove, op. cit.

⁹Dissertation Abstracts International-Retrospective Index (Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1970), p. xi.

¹⁰Complete Guide and Index to ERIC Reports (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970).

determining validity.¹¹

Inservice Training

Special training or instruction for employed persons, including those in the professions, with a view to increasing the workers' competence.¹²

Institute

A brief course of instruction on business or professional problems.¹³

Interest Group

A group of persons having a common identifying interest that often provides a basis for action.¹⁴

Orientation

The process of making a person aware of such factors in his school environment as rules, traditions, and educational offerings, for the purpose of facilitating effective adaptation.¹⁵

Preservice Training

The preparation a person has undergone before assuming a position.¹⁶

¹¹Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1964), p. 382.

¹²Good, op. cit.

¹³Gove, op. cit.

¹⁴Gove, op. cit.

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Ibid.

School Board Member

A citizen elected or appointed in a manner prescribed by law to serve for a limited number of years on the policy-making board of the school district.¹⁷

Seminar

A meeting for giving and discussing information.¹⁸

SRIS

SRIS, School Research Information Service, is a search service of the literature provided by the Phi Delta Kappa Research Service Center.¹⁹

Workshop

A course emphasizing free discussion, exchange of ideas, demonstration of methods, and practical application of skills and principles given mainly for adults already employed in the field.²⁰

PROCEDURES

Current issues of indexes and other guides to sources of literature were read in search of titles pertaining to the problem of the study as well as to the questions. The guides to Dissertation Abstracts, Educational Research Information Center (ERIC), Current Index to Journals of Education (CIJE), Education Index, and the card

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Gove, op. cit.

¹⁹School Research Information Service (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Research Service Center, 1972).

²⁰Gove, op. cit.

catalog were closely scrutinized. Appropriate papers, articles, and books were read for possible inclusion in the study. Notes were taken from those sources containing data which appeared useful. These notes were separated into major categories, and decisions were made as to which materials to include in the study. This was followed by a computer search of ERIC, DATRIX (a search service of Dissertation Abstracts), and SRIS (a search service provided by the Phi Delta Kappa Research Service Center).

Letters were sent to the state school boards associations and the state departments of education in Tennessee and Tennessee's eight bordering states requesting information concerning qualifications for school board members as well as information concerning preservice and inservice training programs for school board members. Information concerning activities that should be included in such a program was also sought.

A survey of school board training practices in Tennessee was conducted. This was accomplished by means of a Questionnaire constructed by this investigator and mailed to the chairmen of the school boards in the 146 school systems of Tennessee, the superintendents of each of these systems, and one board member other than the chairman, randomly chosen from each school system.

After all the data had been collected and analyzed, a comprehensive preservice training program for prospective board members was developed based on the data found. The program was also developed with the intention of serving as an inservice program for presently serving board members.

Once the school board training program was developed, it was field tested for effectiveness. The field testing situation involved

a number of school board members and prospective school board members from the East Tennessee area.

QUESTIONS RELEVANT TO STUDY

The following questions were relevant to this study:

1. What are Tennessee's present qualifications for serving as a school board member?
2. Does Tennessee have any type of preservice or inservice training program for school board members?
3. What are the qualifications for serving as a school board member in Tennessee's bordering states?
4. Do any of these border states have preservice or inservice training programs for school board members?
5. What types of activities should a prospective school board member be familiar with before he assumes his job?
6. Should some type of preservice program be required of all prospective board members?
7. What would such a preservice and/or inservice program consist of?
8. How effective is the preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members when tested under actual working conditions?

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter 1 includes an introduction to the study, the statement of the problem, the significance of the study, the limitations of the study, assumptions, definitions of terms, procedures to be followed,

questions relevant to the study, and this outline of the total organization of the study.

Chapter 2 presents a review of related literature.

Chapter 3 describes the procedures and methodology used in collecting and analyzing the data for the study.

Chapter 4 presents the findings of the study.

Chapter 5 presents the preservice and/or inservice training program for board of education members developed by the investigator and the results of the field testing situation.

Chapter 6 contains the summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations of the study.

Chapter 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

Neal Gross stated that, "many school board members simply do not know what is going on in their school systems."¹ Indeed, this is a startling statement. It is even more upsetting when one stops to consider all the things for which school board members are responsible. According to Archie R. Dykes, millions of dollars of taxpayers' money is placed in board members' hands; but, even more importantly, the future of the nation's youngsters also falls under their jurisdiction. Can anything be done to increase the odds that these school boards will do a satisfactory job? If so, what? Are any school systems taking positive steps in this direction? The job of the school board member is admittedly a difficult and complex one, and much depends on the quality of school board service. Concern regarding the competency of school board members is appropriate.²

Marie S. Ruys expressed the opinion that these days everyone understands the meaning of the word accountability. This is especially

¹Neal Gross, "Easing Strains and Tensions Between Superintendents and Board Members," The Nation's Schools, October 1955, p. 47.

²Archie R. Dykes, School Board and Superintendent: Their Effective Working Relations (Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1965), pp. 167-169.

true of the modern school board member who realizes he must take full responsibility for what happens in his school system. The public wants to be reassured that their board of education is working for them and that their policy makers really can judge the quality of education being bought with tax dollars.³

Ruys felt that the new breed of board member only slightly resembles his predecessor. People today expect much more of their board of education than in previous years. The board member is expected to educate himself so that he will be qualified to judge what is right or wrong with local education as well as any professional educator. This is asking a lot, but it is part of a national move to devise a no-nonsense effort for upgrading schools in a time when public money and confidence are dwindling alarmingly fast.⁴

QUALITIES OF THE EFFECTIVE BOARD MEMBER

According to Lloyd W. Ashby, the qualities which make an effective school board member are similar to those which make for success in any major enterprise. Important among such qualities are intelligence, social conscience, organizational ability, and an understanding of how boards can function most effectively. All of these are needed in any large organization, whether in the field of business or in other types of organization. Successful school board membership is concerned with one single goal--the maintenance and improvement of a local school system. This obviously cannot be measured in the profit

³Marie S. Ruys, "Could You Be a Better Board Member Than You Are?" The American School Board Journal, 160:38, August, 1973.

⁴Ibid.

and loss statement, or in an annual inventory in the business sense of the use of the word.⁵

Ashby further asserted that school board members, in addition to these qualities, need to be able to see the big picture of the meaning of education for all individuals and for a democratic society. The school board member should be one who sees this clearly and sees it as a whole. Finally, his motivations should be those of the individual with no axe to grind for selfish interests, with no ambition except the one of dedication to an improved program for the youngsters of the locale he serves.⁶

Through his studies, Ashby found there were certain traits that marked the effective school board member. First, he was a person who brought to the job an open mind and a willingness to learn. He found great satisfaction in this type of community service. He thought for himself but was willing to accept the fact that the job was one requiring team work and wide use of group processes. Clear differentiation between policy making and administrative roles was one of his strongest points. The school board member had high aspirations for his locality and was capable of conveying these aspirations to the community at large. He always did his homework before board meetings. This individual always strived to understand the aims and objectives of the school system. His ability to interpret the school system to the people was always vividly apparent. The board member kept up with his reading of educational periodicals and attended at least a reason-

⁵Lloyd W. Ashby, The Effective School Board Member (Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1968), pp. 43-47.

⁶Ibid.

able number of educational conferences for board members and administrators. Extremely important was his ability to accept the criticism of individuals or community pressure groups without losing his sense of perspective. Along with this, he did not take criticism as a personal issue. Perhaps more importantly, he could keep a sense of humor in both good times and bad.⁷

HOW A NEW BOARD MEMBER CAN PREPARE HIMSELF FOR HIS NEW JOB

Ward G. Reeder, in his book School Boards and Superintendents, stressed that an effective school board member must instill in himself the spirit of the learner. He must be willing and able to think seriously on school aims, procedures, and problems. He must know how to vote intelligently in board meetings. He must desire to increase his knowledge of present, new, and better school practices. If he does not have these desires and abilities, he cannot give the best possible services to the schools and to the community. If he has these qualities, the board member cannot fail to improve his services.⁸

Edward M. Tuttle believed that whatever previous experience or exercise of judgment the new board member brings with him to his job, in most cases he finds himself facing a set of facts and situations with which he is more or less unfamiliar. Tuttle stated that until the new board member can build up a background of understanding, not only of the local school situation but of the place and potentiality of

⁷Ibid., p. 111.

⁸Ward G. Reeder, School Boards and Superintendents (New York: Macmillan, 1954), pp. 5-9.

public education in the state and nation, his decisions as far as board policy is concerned cannot be of sound and enduring value.⁹

Tuttle believed that it is sometimes difficult for a mature and experienced adult to accept the fact that he will need to invest some solid time and effort in preparing himself for effective service in his new role. Nonetheless, such is the case, and a candidate for school board office should be aware of this necessity when he accepts the responsibility.¹⁰

After he succeeds to board membership, how is the new member to secure most readily and rapidly the needed background knowledge? John C. West, L. H. Dominick, and A. L. Arneson stated in A Handbook for Boards of Education that first, he should, through studying the school laws and reading of literature in the field, attempt to determine just what his duties and responsibilities are. Next, the new member should, by study and through closer acquaintanceship with the school system, attempt to better fit himself for the discharge of his duties.¹¹

In a book by Daniel R. Davies and Elwood Prestwood, the authors pointed out that potentially every new member of a school board has a great deal to contribute to the work of his board of education. Unfortunately, most board members have to serve for a long period of time before they learn as well as possible through personal experience,

⁹Edward M. Tuttle, School Board Leadership in America (Chicago: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1958), pp. 127-130.

¹⁰Ibid.

¹¹A. L. Arneson, L. H. Dominick, and John C. West, A Handbook for Boards of Education (Grand Forks, North Dakota: University of North Dakota Press, 1932), pp. 18-31.

what their board is doing and what they can contribute.¹²

Davies and Prestwood continued by stating that from the time an individual indicates his intention to stand for election to the board until he becomes a successful candidate and full-fledged member, he should make every effort to become acquainted with his responsibilities and determine how he can best carry them out. The member-elect should, if possible, attend board meetings as a visitor, confer with the superintendent and others, and become familiar with board rules and regulations, documents, and other pertinent materials. As he takes his place on the board, he should continue to strive to become an effective member.¹³

INFORMING SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

In their book, The Challenge of School Board Memberships, Daniel R. Davies and Fred W. Hosler emphasized the importance of keeping the board member well informed. The board member must be kept up-to-date on the developments within the school system. He must remain sensitive at all times to the needs, wishes, and aspirations of the community for its schools. More broadly, he must acquaint himself with national educational developments and trends, since so many of the decisions he is called upon to make depend on an awareness of such matters.¹⁴

¹²Daniel R. Davies and Elwood Prestwood, School Board Procedures (New York: Chartwell House, 1951), pp. 7-26.

¹³Ibid.

¹⁴Daniel R. Davies and Fred W. Hosler, The Challenge of School Board Membership (New York: Chartwell House, 1951), pp. 10-13

Davies and Hosler stressed that the board member's sources of information are many. One of the major sources is the superintendent of schools and his staff. The board members must rely heavily upon the superintendent for help, especially for interpretations of the operation of the local school system and for developments and trends in education in general. Board members are also encouraged by Davies and Hosler to join local, state, and national school board associations. Then, too, there is a wealth of printed matter easily accessible to board members. Such publications as The School Board Journal and School Management can be extremely informative.¹⁵

According to Davies and Hosler, because of the limitations of time and energy, the board member must choose carefully which sources of information he will use. He must constantly bear in mind, however, that the supreme object of his becoming informed about the educational aspects of his job and the aspirations of his community is that he may then intelligently use the tremendous power he possesses in determining educational policy for his local school system.¹⁶

Dykes, a former superintendent and professor of educational administration, dealt with the problem of informing school board members in his book, School Board and Superintendent: Their Effective Working Relationships. Dykes stated that keeping the board well informed would make it more effective. He felt that no single technique of keeping the board informed is adequate. In addition to memoranda and bulletins, special interpretative programs at board meetings, special reports to the board from principals, teachers, and

¹⁵Ibid.

¹⁶Ibid., pp. 147-149.

supervisors, participation of board members in professional meetings, and programs presented by students all are of informational value and may be used to the best possible advantage. Such techniques will keep the board apprised of that which it needs to know in order to function efficiently and wisely. The informational program should be designed to make board members the best informed people in the community on all educational matters.¹⁷

THE TENNESSEE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

According to William B. Rich, the Tennessee School Boards Association, since its formation, has attempted to make the board member's job a little easier. One of the ways in which this has been accomplished has been through conventions or annual meetings since 1939. One of the major purposes of these annual meetings has been to provide information on problems and issues confronting the school boards. Programs for the meetings have been varied, both as to topic and manner of presentation.¹⁸

Rich said that the Association has also sponsored a series of district meetings or conferences for school board members since 1945. During recent years, efforts have been made to hold these meetings in different communities each year and to locate them within a fifty mile radius of every board member in that part of the state. The most commonly discussed topic for these district meetings has been school

¹⁷Dykes, op. cit., pp. 131-133.

¹⁸William B. Rich, "The Tennessee School Boards Association" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1956), pp. 121-130.

finance.¹⁹

Rich believed that one of the most important services the Tennessee School Boards Association extends to its members has been the publication of The Tennessee School Board Bulletin. The stated purposes of the bulletin include the providing of information which will aid the school board member in becoming better informed concerning his responsibility as a school board member and methods or techniques for improving operation of school boards.²⁰

According to Rich, the Association also prints a publication entitled Handbook for Tennessee School Board Members. Contained in the handbook is a brief history of the school boards association, a brief discussion of the local school board and its members, suggestions for school board organization and operation, school board-superintendent relationships, and a description of the personnel, finance, school plant, curriculum, and community-relationship functions of a school board.²¹

Rich stated that other services provided by the Association include the filling of requests for various types of information and certain definite services to its members pertaining to state educational legislation. The Association in recent years has taken advantage of the opportunity to develop the latter service, educational legislation, to its fullest extent.²²

Rich continued by saying that the Tennessee School Boards Association has a written policy concerning orientation of newly

¹⁹Ibid., pp. 130-144.

²⁰Ibid., pp. 144-146.

²¹Ibid., pp. 146-148.

²²Ibid., pp. 148-151.

elected school board members. This program, however, is limited to the mailing of a kit of materials to each new school board member. This kit contains booklets, leaflets, and various other materials pertaining to school boards.²³

Rich also found that the Association sponsors institutes, workshops, and clinics for the improvement of school board members in service. Unfortunately, this service area has been greatly underutilized. Inservice training is also provided through the handbook for board members, articles in the association bulletin, and opportunities for improvement by attendance and participation in district and annual meetings.²⁴

Rich made a comprehensive study of the Tennessee School Boards Association. It is the most complete study of the Association that has been carried out. In his recommendations, Rich stated that the Association, in cooperation with the Department of Education and the state colleges and universities, should sponsor an annual meeting or series of meetings for the orientation of the new school board member to his duties and responsibilities. He further recommended that the Association include more frequent institutes or workshops for the improvement of school board members in service. Such workshops or institutes should be designed to present a comprehensive treatment of specific issues or problems of concern to school boards. Rich felt these learning situations should be sponsored by the Association in cooperation with the universities and colleges throughout the state.²⁵

²³Ibid., p. 192.

²⁴Ibid., pp. 192-193.

²⁵Ibid., pp. 219-221.

SCHOOL BOARD TRAINING PROCEDURES

One is hard pressed to find research dealing with school board training programs, either preservice or inservice programs. Although it was mentioned as a secondary objective, a number of studies dealt with the matter indirectly. In addition, several pieces of research stated the need for such training programs in their recommendations, but very few studies actually tackled the problem head on.

In a speech delivered at a board of education conference, Marion A. McGhehy stated that systematic orientation procedures were uncommon. He felt the informal and limited methods existing were quite inadequate. McGhehy continued by stating that he believed school board members ordinarily required a year or more to become familiar with their duties.²⁶

In a study undertaken at Indiana University, Harley M. Lautenschlager attempted to learn from school board members the techniques which had best helped them to understand the characteristics of a modern school program and its operation since becoming school board members. He also sought to discover the relative effectiveness of each of the techniques. The findings indicated that school board members depended heavily upon their superintendents for information, guidance, and leadership. Board members felt that parent-teacher groups rendered valuable assistance to school boards. Enthusiasm was expressed by board members for the stimulation, guidance, and information received through state and national associations of school

²⁶Marion A. McGhehy, Toward More Effective Boards of Education, ed. Harlan D. Been (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), pp. 9-23.

boards. Regularly scheduled, well-organized, local school board meetings, including an agenda and supplementary materials mailed to board members at least three days prior to board meetings, were extremely helpful to board members. Visiting schools outside of their own districts have also been helpful to board members.²⁷

Ronald E. Weitman made an analytical study of the inservice educational needs of the chairmen of boards of education in Georgia. Weitman found that in order to assure more competent leadership by board members on the policy-making level, it was necessary to have school board members who were well oriented to the problems and functions of the schools. It was assumed that not all board members possessed the desirable competencies. Therefore, it was necessary that the needs which bear upon their responsibilities be identified.²⁸

A degree of "some felt need" for inservice help expressed by the board chairmen was among Weitman's more important findings. The two areas in which the greatest need was felt by board chairmen were "The School Board and the Educational Program" and "The Board and Broad Issues." These areas emphasized evaluation of school programs and broad issues such as mass, compulsory education, and changing federal policies toward education.²⁹

The implications of Weitman's study indicated that board

²⁷Harley M. Lautenschlager, "A Study of School Board Inservice Training Techniques" (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1956), pp. 93-101.

²⁸Ronald E. Weitman, "An Analytical Study of the Inservice Educational Needs of the Chairmen of Boards of Education in Georgia" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1960), pp. 133-142.

²⁹Ibid.

chairmen are deeply interested in schools. The results of this study suggested that one of the quickest means by which all board members could be assisted in performing better their functions would be by the publication and subsequent widespread use of a School Board Manual for Georgia. The writer also felt that a highly developed inservice program was the best means by which to meet the needs of board members.³⁰

A study to determine whether or not present inservice activities are meeting the needs of Colorado Boards of Education was carried out by Benjamin A. Kammer in 1968. Particular attention was given to the determination of board members' effectiveness as related to their participation in inservice activities. He found that Colorado school board members who participated in regional, state, and national school board or administrators' meetings were perceived by their superintendents as being more effective than non-participants. Those board members who took part and assisted in the development of orientation activities to assist new members were rated more effective by superintendents than non-participants. The data indicated that school board members who attended on-campus college conferences were perceived to be more effective than non-participants. Board members who discussed and helped in the preparation or revision of the boards' policy manual were judged more effective by superintendents. Overall, the findings showed progressive, observed effectiveness with increased inservice activity.³¹

³⁰Ibid., pp. 143-144.

³¹Benjamin A. Kammer, "Effective School Board Behavior as It Relates to School Board Inservice Activities in the State of Colorado" (Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1968), pp. 80-86.

Kammer concluded that inservice training for school board members did improve their effectiveness as viewed by their superintendents. He felt improved and expanded inservice education procedures were needed for Colorado school board members in the following areas: (1) understanding and accepting the purposes and objectives of a modern school, (2) suspending judgment on controversial issues until all of the facts are presented, (3) willingness to devote time to promoting the welfare of the schools within the community other than time spent in board meetings, (4) willingness to devote time away from the community in promoting the welfare of public schools, (5) feeling of responsibility for improving education on a state level, (6) generally displaying both tact and firmness, (7) vigorously seeking adequate financial support for the schools, and (8) effectively interpreting the school program to the community. He also felt there was a need to increase attendance of Colorado school board members at regional, state, and national school board or administrative meetings. Finally, there was a need for the continuation and expansion of orientation procedures for new members.³²

James R. Andrews, in his statement on training for board membership, asserted that:

The school board must make the important decisions concerning the school system. The degree to which each individual board member is informed or uninformed will be reflected in the decisions of the board of education. Adequate information and proper training for board membership should be made available to new school board members at the beginning of their term of office.³³

³²Ibid., pp. 91-93.

³³James R. Andrews, "A Study of the Perceptions Held by New School Board Members Toward Their Training for Board Membership" (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1971), p. 3.

Andrews' study, completed in 1971 at Indiana University, had as its purpose identifying the kind of information and experience which should be utilized in orienting new school board members to the responsibilities and authority of board membership. Among the more important findings of this study was that the orientation process for new school board members should start as soon as possible following the election or appointment. Some of the experiences recommended for newly elected school board members were: (1) superintendent-board member conferences, (2) attendance at board meetings before taking office, (3) attendance at regional and state meetings of the school boards associations, and (4) a tour of local educational facilities. Generally speaking, it was found that public relations and school finance had been the major problem areas for new school board members. Andrews concluded that little commonality existed in school board orientation among the states and that extensive research and related material was not available in the area of new school board member orientation.³⁴

A study completed in 1970 at Temple University by Frederick C. Sales dealt with the orientation of new school board members. The study was undertaken in order to: (1) determine what is being done in local school districts to provide orientation for new school board members, (2) evaluate the effectiveness of orientation being received by new board members, (3) determine what new board members feel should be done to assist them to become oriented more quickly and effectively, (4) determine how long it takes a new board member to become oriented

³⁴Ibid., pp. 82-90.

to his job, and (5) determine whose responsibility orientation actually is. The study revealed that employers were either supportive or permissive in their attitudes toward employees being on the board. Therefore, some time away from work for orientation would appear to be feasible.³⁵

The major conclusions of Sales' study were that board members and superintendents agreed that an orientation program was "very important." However, the enthusiasm for the need was not matched in deeds insofar as the quantity or quality of orientation programs provided. At a given time, up to a third of the members of the board were in their first two years of service. Thus, the need for orientation is continuous.³⁶

Sales determined that most board members did not receive a copy of the school district's philosophy as a part of their orientation. Those members who received specific information rated the quality of orientation as "good" or "excellent" in all areas except that of curriculum and instruction. Orientation should have begun as soon as the member was appointed or elected and should have continued through the early months of office.³⁷

Sales found that, overall, board members received less than half of the specific information they would have liked to have received. They received the greatest amount of information in the area of finance and business management. They received the least amount of information

³⁵Frederick C. Sales, "A Survey of the Orientation of New School Board Members by Selected Local School Districts" (Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1970), pp. 7-9.

³⁶Ibid., pp. 216-220.

³⁷Ibid., p. 222.

in the area of curriculum and instruction. The board members felt that orientation took from six months to one year to complete. However, superintendents felt that it took from one year to eighteen months. There was no agreement among board members as to who should be responsible for orientation. Most superintendents felt that the responsibility rested with the superintendent. Very few districts provided their new board member with a locally prepared orientation handbook.³⁸

Sales recommended that superintendents assume leadership in providing an orientation program for new board members. Superintendents should recognize that new board members want information on all facets of school system operation, not just finance and business management.³⁹

According to Charles E. Reeves there is a need for "educating" school board members:

What is meant is that they need to be informed about the principles and techniques of the work of school boards and to be brought to appreciate the fundamental place of the school board in the control, administration, and operation of the public schools. They need to know what constitutes the acceptable practices by which school boards conduct their business.⁴⁰

Reeves declared that board members are representatives of the people, and their thoughts concerning education before they assumed office have been like those of the usual citizen. These ideas have been limited largely to matters arising from the contacts they have had with some particular school their children attend, to the taxes they

³⁸Ibid., pp. 163-169.

³⁹Ibid., p. 222.

⁴⁰Charles E. Reeves, School Boards: Their Status, Functions, and Activities (New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954), pp. 306-311.

pay to support schools, and perhaps to what they have learned from the few school administrators and teachers they know.⁴¹

Reeves stated that most new board members know little of the business practices of the school system before taking office. They know little of the means used for financing the schools. They know, only in a vague way, of the potentials in such an area as audiovisual education and what, if anything, the school system is doing to make use of it. They are only vaguely aware of the future requirements for school buildings. These new members think of the curriculum as the kinds of experience provided by the school for learning thirty or forty years ago.⁴²

Reeves continued by saying that some years ago the Illinois Association of School Boards adopted a resolution on "Information for School Board Members." The resolution stated that the Illinois Association of School Boards advocated that every possible effort be expended to develop among all school board members in the state a lively understanding of their serious responsibilities. Also, they urged that every agency of education consciously undertake the inservice training of new school board members to the details of their duties.⁴³

Reeves felt there should be more than an administration of the oath of office for the preparation of a board member in order for him to participate fully in the work of the board. He continued by saying it should not be expected that new school board members be indoctrinated into the opinions held by the retiring members; that would not

⁴¹Ibid.

⁴²Ibid.

⁴³Ibid.

be desirable. They have their own contributions to make in representing the public that selected them. Their orientation should be the attaining of knowledge of the conditions and problems facing the schools and the available resources of the schools for meeting them.⁴⁴

According to Reeves, it is assumed that new school board members come to the board as amateurs in the principles of school control and administration, though some of them may be expert in the control and administration of other enterprises. Further, it is assumed that new members can apply such principles of control and administration as they know, but not always wisely unless they have a background of facts relating to the school system, the laws and rules by which it operates, and the ability to evaluate the soundness of the recommendations of the superintendent. The purpose of the orientation is to give to new members information basic to the rapid learning of the duties and responsibilities of the school board in order that they will have some basis for making judgments in the formation of their opinions. All members of school boards will need to do outside readings in order to gain information on the principles and practices of school control, school administration, and the more general principles of teaching and learning.⁴⁵

Reeves declared that the school board's functions are not limited to monthly meetings, the approval of properly audited bills for the purchase of goods, and the rubber stamping of the recommendations made by the superintendent. Rather, the board should act intelligently as a legislative and approval body, rejecting

⁴⁴Ibid.

⁴⁵Ibid.

recommendations it considers unsound or impracticable, initiating desirable measures, and accepting the responsibility for administrative actions of its executive officer and his assistants. As the state and federal legislative bodies have machinery for investigating the needs for legislation by maintaining research staffs, holding committee hearings, and traveling to secure firsthand information, so should school board members secure information to aid them in acting intelligently. Also, school board members should avail themselves of the opportunities to attend meetings of their associations--regional, state, and national.⁴⁶

In Billy L. Conley's study of boards of education in ten selected states of the southern region, the most significant conclusion was that national, regional, and state school board associations should consider placing more emphasis on inservice or orientation programs designed for local school boards.⁴⁷

In a research project carried out at the University of Virginia, Alpheus L. White selected for study, among other things, the problem of inservice training for school board members. He discovered that a large body of research dealing with effective methods and materials for use in locally organized inservice board training programs was non-existent. One of White's major conclusions was that basic research in this problem area had not been made. White recommended that additional research be conducted to determine effective board inservice training

⁴⁶Ibid.

⁴⁷Billy L. Conley, "A Study of Boards of Education in the Southern Region" (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1962), p. 209.

techniques and materials and to determine state department of education responsibilities in school board inservice training programs.⁴⁸

Donald F. Wyss conducted a study in order to investigate certain characteristics of school board members, the agencies and reasons influencing members to become candidates for the board, and certain of their activities in becoming trained for their positions and in serving their schools. One of his conclusions having to do with board member training was that school board members who attend meetings and read extensively tend to be more active in attempting to improve their schools than members who do not.⁴⁹

State school board associations were studied in twelve selected states by Leslie G. Carter in an attempt to determine the contributions made to public education by those associations. Among the suggestions made by Carter at the conclusion of the study were that state school board associations provide inservice training for school board members by workshops and district meetings and that an orientation manual be provided for each newly elected or appointed school board member.⁵⁰

James C. Porterfield's study on attitudes and opinions of school board members in Nebraska concentrated upon the duties and responsibilities of boards of education. Upon completion of the study,

⁴⁸Alpheus L. White, "A Summary and Analysis of Significant Research Findings on Selected School Board Problems" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1959), pp. 264-272.

⁴⁹Donald F. Wyss, "Certain Characteristics and Activities of School Board Members in Missouri" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1960), pp. 214-215.

⁵⁰Leslie G. Carter, "State School Board Associations in Twelve Selected States" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1954), pp. 195-197.

his only recommendation was that every individual, organization, and institution interested in the public school initiate a program of learning experiences which is designed and planned to develop among all school board members a knowledge and understanding of their duties and responsibilities and a clear concept of desirable and acceptable practices.⁵¹

A study dealing with what public school board members in the United States wanted to know about their schools was conducted by Avon G. Shannon at the University of Arkansas. Recommendations resulting from the study included the following:

1. Public school board members should use to better advantage all available means of finding out what they want and need to know about school affairs.
2. National, state, and local boards should revitalize their efforts to provide board members with the desired information.
3. State departments of education, state teachers' associations, and state administrators' associations should cooperate more effectively in finding the desired information and presenting it clearly to board members.
4. Greater effort should be given to providing new board members with needed information in the early months of their service.⁵²

⁵¹James C. Porterfield, "Attitudes and Opinions of School Board Members in Nebraska Concerning the Duties and Responsibilities of Boards of Education" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers College, 1957), pp. 171-172.

⁵²Avon G. Shannon, "What Public School Board Members in the United States Want to Know About Their Schools: With Special Reference to Arkansas" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1959), pp. 179-180.

According to James D. Lacey, state departments of education, state school boards associations, and state superintendent associations should coordinate efforts in promoting the inservice education of board members and superintendents. An orientation manual, delineating the respective duties of these school officials, should be developed jointly by these groups as an aid to inservice education programs.⁵³

Richard L. Philipson and Roger C. Seager reported that the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision of the University of Wisconsin, in an effort to aid school board members with their jobs, organized a series of clinics to help school boards analyze and solve problems. The stated rationale behind this program was that although board members are usually drawn from the more able segments of society, they approach increasingly difficult problems with little or no formal preparation for such responsibilities.⁵⁴

In 1971, Bob Coleman conducted a study concerning the various aspects of school boards in Tennessee. To collect the needed information, he mailed questionnaires to all the superintendents in the state of Tennessee. The percentage of returns upon which the study was based was 88.75. Two of the questions on the questionnaire were, "Should prospective board members attend or participate in an orientation session before appointment or election to the board?" and "Should newly elected or appointed board members participate in

⁵³James D. Lacey, "An Analysis of the Respective Duties and Functions of Selected Florida Superintendents and School Boards" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1962), pp. 209-213.

⁵⁴Richard L. Philipson and Roger C. Seager, eds., School Boards and School Board Problems, a Clinical Approach (Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967), pp. 5-11.

inservice training sessions after election or appointment to the board?" On the first question, 75 percent of the superintendents answered "yes," 23 percent answered "no," and there was "no response" from 2 percent. On the second question, 90 percent answered "yes," 9 percent answered "no," and there was "no response" from 1 percent. As a result of the study, Coleman concluded there is a need to involve board candidates in some kind of orientation prior to their election or appointment. After becoming a board member, the need for inservice training to upgrade the board members and to help them to become more effective was indicated.⁵⁵

According to Wayne L. Pratt and Irving W. Scott, a rather unique program has been set up by the Bureau of Indian Affairs on five Indian reservations in the West. School board training is conducted by the Bureau eight times a year for approximately three hundred adult Navajos. Major topics studied include curriculum development, parent-school community-school relationships, training problems, and staff selection.⁵⁶ The program itself is divided into four major parts: the introduction, duties and responsibilities of a school board, useful information for school board members, and problems faced by school boards.⁵⁷

⁵⁵Bob Coleman, "Survey of Tennessee School Boards," Tennessee School Boards Journal, 24:5-7, March, 1973.

⁵⁶Wayne L. Pratt and Irving W. Stout, "Navajo Community School Boards Speak Out: A Summary of Navajo Thought About Education," Navajo School Board Training Project (Window Rock, Arizona: Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1972), pp. 48-69.

⁵⁷Wayne L. Pratt and Irving W. Stout, "Introduction to School Board Training," Navajo School Board Training Project (Window Rock, Arizona: Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1972), pp. 2-5.

Pratt and Stout stated that conclusions reached by consultants actively involved in The Navajo Community School Board Training Project included the following: the Navajos took the training sessions seriously; the trainees could not be rushed; the trainees recognized the values of both the old and the new in such matters as curriculum; the greatest area of sensitivity was in the field of relationships; and, finally, the trainees recognized their own limitations and freely expressed a desire for continued training.⁵⁸

A descriptive study of the inservice education programs of the Wyoming School Boards Association (WSBA) was conducted by John M. Drayer in 1970. One of the purposes of this study was the determination of the extent of satisfaction with inservice board member education programs sponsored by the WSBA. Both WSBA members and non-members were included in the study. Only the opinions of individuals who had participated in the inservice programs were solicited. Both WSBA members and non-members indicated satisfaction with the total program, but they were both especially impressed with the value of the area workshops sponsored by the WSBA. All respondents favored continuation of the area workshops. A slight majority of the respondents favored inservice education programs at annual conventions. Drayer recommended that the Wyoming School Boards Association develop a philosophy of inservice education for school board members. He also recommended that the WSBA investigate the possibility of conducting pre-election

⁵⁸Wayne L. Pratt and Irving W. Stout, "Summary Report of Training Activities," Navajo School Board Training Project (Window Rock, Arizona: Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1972), pp. 1-15.

orientation workshops for prospective school board members.⁵⁹

A study of effective school board membership in Indiana was completed in 1971 by James L. Rohrbaugh. His major recommendation resulting from the study was that the Indiana School Boards Association should work with local superintendents in the development of programs for workshops and inservice activities for new school board members and other board members.⁶⁰

Donald L. Piper made his position concerning school board members quite clear when he stated:

Many board members are elected or appointed to their positions with little or no formal preparation for the difficult tasks facing them and no way to develop their skills except in the school of hard knocks.⁶¹

Piper stated that the state of New York is now involved in a statewide effort to try to help school board members. New York state has been divided into twelve school board institutes or districts, each serving board members within a given geographical area. The primary purpose of the institutes is to provide inservice training for school board members. Each is centered at a college or university in its area, and a member of the university faculty usually serves as coordinator or executive secretary. Participation by school boards in institute programs is voluntary. Each institute tries to arrange from four to

⁵⁹John M. Drayer, "A Descriptive Study of the Inservice Education Programs of the Wyoming School Boards Association" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1970), pp. 220-223.

⁶⁰James L. Rohrbaugh, "A Study of Effective School Board Membership in Indiana" (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1967), p. 311.

⁶¹Donald L. Piper, "Help for Beleaguered Board Members," School Management, May 1972, pp. 20-21.

six major programs each year. In addition, some groups provide special workshops for new board members and seminars and mini-courses on topics of interest. Piper summed up his feelings about providing educational opportunities for school board members by saying that the need for such opportunities appears to be beyond question.⁶²

Lorraine O'Brien completed a study of New York City school boards with special reference to inservice education. She found that the concept of inservice education was rather new. Furthermore, the field of education had not been alone in contributing to the advances in this area. The research and experience of business and industry had added greatly to the knowledge about inservice education. In business and industry almost all organizations engaged in some type of orientation education for new employees.

O'Brien stated that most lists of human needs include the need for: security, satisfaction, status, a feeling of success, a sense of belonging, affection, recognition, and new experiences. She felt that to insure the success of any inservice program, as many of these needs as possible must be met. No matter what the nature of the inservice program to be given, there always are available opportunities to praise those taking part, give them tasks which they can accomplish with success and satisfaction, give them a feeling of belonging to a group endeavor, introduce them to new ways of thinking, and give them sincere recognition before their fellow participants for those tasks they do well. One of the most important positive values of inservice programs found by O'Brien was that the participants felt more secure

⁶²Ibid.

in carrying out their jobs once they had completed such a program. Their new skills and knowledge gave them confidence in conducting those activities that were an important part of their duties and responsibilities.⁶³

O'brien concluded by stating that most organizations focused their inservice program on three general objectives: (1) acquiring knowledge, (2) developing skill, and (3) developing or modifying attitudes. Seemingly, the most effective method or technique of inservice education or training was the conference or workshop approach. Finally, it was found that the secret to the success of any inservice program was continuous evaluation.⁶⁴

A large number of mini-courses looking into practically every aspect of operating the public schools was offered to school board members and administrators at the convention of the National School Boards Association this past year. The convention consisted of four or five days filled with activities selected by experts for their importance to the business of school boardmanship. The convention, which has come to be known as the annual "University of Boardmanship," offered boardsmen and administrators opportunities to confer with expert practitioners on an impressive list of topics. Four general sessions were also scheduled, each with a nationally known speaker and two with special programs dealing graphically with board problems. Boardmen and administrators also had an opportunity to examine several

⁶³Lorraine O'brien, "Inservice Education for Board of Education Personnel: Special Reference to New York City" (Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958), pp. 15-48.

⁶⁴Ibid., pp. 89-91.

million dollars worth of new educational products and services.

Exhibits were manned by trained personnel on hand to answer questions.⁶⁵

THE FUTURE

Dykes summed up the current status of boards of education when he concluded that:

Today in America, lay boards of education are at a cross-roads. There are many who feel they have no place in modern-day education. They point to archaic practices of many boards, their seeming inability to cope with change and the new problems which follow, and their tendency to degrade their important functions of goal setting and policy making into involvement in trivia. Serious controversies and difficulties in many communities between the school boards and the school superintendents and the subsequent disruption of the educational program are cited. The contention that local school boards, because of traditionalism and provincialism, prevent the attainment of quality education is increasingly articulated.⁶⁶

Dykes felt that much of what the critics say is true and cannot be disputed. Qualified observers of the educational scene agree that in too many instances local control of education, as exercised through the local school board and the local school superintendent, stands in the way of educational progress. For many school boards improvement is urgently needed in board practices, in understanding of school board functions and responsibilities, in awareness of social and cultural problems, and in the working relationship which exists between the boards and the superintendents. Unless such improvement is made, local educational leadership cannot meet the new

⁶⁵"How About a Couple of Hundred Ways to Be a Better Boardman or Administrator," The American School Board Journal, 159:39, February, 1972.

⁶⁶Dykes, op. cit., p. 213.

and urgent demands being placed upon it.⁶⁷

Dykes continued by saying that at a time when public education is of such consequence to the ambitions of the American people, inefficiency or inability to cope with emerging issues will not be tolerated. Today, local control as a principle of public education is up for questioning. Indictments and criticisms have come from many sources. All point to the lack of leadership from the local level in solving the great new problems now upon public education. Ineffective leadership from the local level has created belief in some quarters that local control constitutes a serious obstacle to educational progress. Obviously, a significant breakthrough is needed if solutions to today's educational problems are to be found; but, critics of local control point out that under the hand of local school boards, progress toward solutions is moving at a snail's pace, if at all.⁶⁸

Dykes concluded by stating that local control will continue as a basic principle of public education only if local school boards can make the changes which modern conditions require. The challenge is plainly before local school boards and superintendents. They must continue to improve their operational procedures and the quality of their leadership while relating themselves to the crucial issues of a complex, rapidly changing society. Local control of education, as manifested through local school boards and superintendents, has long been a cornerstone of American education. It cannot continue as such

⁶⁷Ibid.

⁶⁸Ibid., pp. 214-233.

if school boards and superintendents permit themselves to become obstacles to educational progress.⁶⁹

⁶⁹Ibid., pp. 234-235.

Chapter 3

PROCEDURES AND METHODOLOGY

Since the major task of this study was to develop a preservice training program for prospective board of education members, a description of the procedures employed and methodology used to accomplish this purpose is presented in this chapter.

It was necessary to complete the following tasks in order to achieve the objectives of this study:

1. Obtain computer searches of the related literature from at least three of the major research organizations and conduct a careful review of the related literature.
2. Send letters seeking information pertaining to the study to the state school boards associations and the state departments of education in Tennessee and in Tennessee's eight bordering states.
3. Select the school systems and subjects to participate in the study.
4. Construct a survey instrument capable of measuring the school board training practices in Tennessee.
5. Develop a procedure for collecting the data.
6. Evaluate the data.
7. Develop a preservice and/or inservice training program for board of education members.
8. Field test the training program for school board members.

RELATED LITERATURE

A review of the literature pertaining to preservice and/or inservice training programs for board of education members was conducted. This was a very important part of the study because from this search the investigator found much of the data on which to base the training program for school board members. Such information as the criteria board members feel should be included in such a program, factors administrators and others feel should be included in such a program, programs now in existence, and other related data were examined carefully.

This particular step of the study was carried out in the following manner: current issues of indexes and other guides to sources of literature were read in search of titles pertaining to the problem of the study as well as to the questions. The guides to Dissertation Abstracts, Educational Research Information Center (ERIC), Current Index to Journals of Education (CIJE), Education Index, and the card catalog were studied carefully. Appropriate papers, articles, and books were read for possible inclusion in the study. Notes were taken from those sources containing data felt to be useful. These notes were separated into major categories, and decisions were made as to what material to include in the study.

In addition to the manual search, this investigator had computer searches run on ERIC, DATRIX, and SRIS materials. Once the searches were completed, a process similar to the one above was followed in an effort to locate further information helpful in the development of the training program for board of education members. All relevant data were organized for possible inclusion in the study.

INFORMATION OBTAINED FROM LETTERS PERTAINING TO QUALIFICATIONS AND TRAINING PROGRAMS

A letter was composed and sent to the state school boards associations and state departments of education in Tennessee and in Tennessee's eight bordering states. These eight border states consisted of Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, and Virginia. Three major types of information were sought by means of this letter. The first inquiry was concerned with what the qualifications are for becoming a school board member in the nine states listed above. The major interest here was to see if any of these states required prospective or new board members to participate in any type of training program either before or after being elected to their positions. Secondly, the letter requested information concerning preservice or inservice training programs for school board members as they now exist, if at all, in these nine states. The last major objective of the letter was to request any information or suggestions as to what should be included in a training program for school board members. Data collected from this step of the study were included in the study and all information was summarized in table form.

SELECTION OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS AND SUBJECTS

The selection of Tennessee and Tennessee's border states as the states to receive the letter concerning school board member qualifications, preservice or inservice training programs, and items to include in such a program was an arbitrary choice of the investigator. Tennessee was the state which served as the focal point of

the study. The eight border states were included for purposes of comparison as well as to see how several states, rather than one, were handling the problem of orientation of new or prospective school board members.

In order to get a better view of what Tennessee was doing with reference to preservice or inservice training for school board members than could possibly be achieved from the state school board association or the state department of education, it was decided by the investigator to conduct a survey of the 146 school systems in the state of Tennessee. This was done by means of a Questionnaire sent to the chairmen of the boards of education in the school systems in Tennessee, the superintendents of each of these systems, and one board member, other than the chairman, randomly chosen from each school system.

The reason subjects were selected from each school system in the state of Tennessee, rather than randomly chosen from the whole state, was that a picture of the situation from system to system was needed. This would not have been possible if subjects had been selected at large from the state. The rationale for including the board chairmen was that it was felt these individuals had a better and more complete picture of the orientation procedure for new or prospective board members in their school system. Furthermore, the chairmen were generally individuals of experience in school board matters who were helpful as far as suggesting points to be stressed in a training program for school board members.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT

It was believed by this investigator that a survey of school board member training practices in Tennessee was needed to help

answer the questions and to help with the development of the training program for board of education members. It was also felt, for reasons stated earlier, that the best way to accomplish this was to send a Questionnaire to the chairmen of the 146 school boards in the state of Tennessee, the superintendents of each of these systems, and one board member, other than the chairman, randomly chosen from each school system. Since no satisfactory instrument for this purpose could be found, the decision was made to construct the necessary instrument.

The survey instrument was used to determine if each school system had any type of training program for board members and, if so, how did the program function. More importantly, what points did the chairmen of the boards, the superintendents, and the other board members stress as being most important for such a training program?

The investigator decided not to make any attempt to distinguish among school systems as to whether or not they had a board member training program, primarily due to the fact that if systems were compared by names in the study it could have been embarrassing to some of the systems, especially those which had done very little along the lines of preservice or inservice training of school board members. This could have resulted in biased or inaccurate answers, or perhaps failure to answer the Questionnaire at all. Therefore, when the Questionnaires were sent out, they were accompanied by a letter assuring the recipient that there was no need to sign the form nor would there be any attempt made to discover which Questionnaire came from which school system. The data from the Questionnaire were organized by percentage, numbers, and lists, and not by school system names. It was hoped that by following this procedure the most useful

information available could be obtained.

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTING DATA

Once the computer searches and the review of related literature were completed, the information was analyzed and all useful data were included in the study.

As the responses to the letters sent to the state school boards associations and state departments of education in Tennessee and Tennessee's eight bordering states were received, the data were organized into various categories. It was then summarized and placed in table form for ease of interpretation and maximum use. The three major categories of information that were received here dealt with qualifications for becoming a school board member in the nine states studied, whether or not these states had any type of training programs for school board members, and suggestions as to what a training program should include.

Possibly the most important part of the research was the survey of the 146 school systems in Tennessee. As the Questionnaires were returned, the answers were organized in such a way as to make as clear as possible the school board training practices in the state of Tennessee. Whether training programs existed in the school systems, what types of programs did exist, and suggestions for such training programs were the kinds of information that were collected by the Questionnaire. The data were organized by category, summarized, and presented in table form.

EVALUATION OF DATA

Before proceeding to develop the training program for school board members, this investigator carefully organized, categorized, and evaluated all data collected. Evaluation was continuous throughout the study, but here a more thorough and complete evaluation of the data took place. This was an extremely important step because any attempt to develop the training program before carefully evaluating the data would have been to venture forth blindly. Only after this step was completed did the investigator continue with the study.

DEVELOPING THE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

Once all of the data had been collected from the manual and computer searches made of the literature, the letters sent to the various state school boards associations and state departments of education and from the survey of the 146 school systems in Tennessee, the major step of the study was to develop the preservice training program for prospective school board members. As was stated earlier, this program was meant to be suitable as an inservice training program for school board members already serving.

Data collected through the research provided the information needed to develop the training program. The most important information needed was what should, or must, be included in a program of this nature. The research methods already discussed provided this information.

The overall goal of this training program for school board members was that it be flexible and consistent with current trends.

The following paragraphs contain a general outline of the program.

The first question answered was, "Where should the training program be held?" Obviously, the site should provide both prospective and veteran school board members with the ultimate opportunity for a sound learning experience.

The next problem could be voiced by the question, "By whom should the training program be offered?" Should it be sponsored by the local superintendent, the local school board, the state department of education, the state school boards association, the National School Boards Association, or by whom?

The next topic for consideration concerned the type of speakers that should be used. Should lay or professional speakers be used?

When should a training program be offered and how long should it last? Should the program be offered before the election, soon after, several months later, or not at all? Should the program last a few hours, one day, a weekend, or how long?

In addition to the major objectives of the training program, it was hoped that the program would help school board members to become more inquisitive and not be so quick to accept at face value everything the superintendent and others had to say. This was the place where all the items that should be included in such a training program for school board members were discussed.

The last major area of the training program dealt with the question, "How?" The purpose of this section was to describe just how a successful training program for board of education members should be conducted.

FIELD TESTING THE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

After the training program for school board members was developed, it was field tested on a number of school board members and prospective school board members from the East Tennessee area. The validity of the program was checked by means of a pretest and a posttest. The pretest was administered to the school board members and prospective school board members at the beginning of the program and the posttest was given upon the completion of the program. Both tests were very similar and were based on those competencies found during the study to be important for school board members to be able to function effectively. Upon the completion of the program the pretest scores and posttest scores were compared by means of a t-test. The details and results of the field testing situation are found in Chapter 6.

SUMMARY

Chapter 3 provided a rationale and description of the procedures and methodology utilized in this study. The major task of this study was to develop a training program for school board members.

A manual search and three computer searches of the literature pertaining to the problem of the study were carried out. A letter seeking information pertinent to the study was sent to the state school boards associations and the state departments of education in Tennessee and in Tennessee's eight bordering states. An instrument to survey the training practices for school board members in Tennessee was constructed for this study. It was in the form of a Questionnaire

and was sent to the chairmen of the 146 school boards in the state of Tennessee, the superintendents in each of these 146 school systems, and one board member, other than the chairman, randomly chosen from each school system. Once all the data were collected and organized, a process was developed for training board of education members.

After the school board member training program was developed, it was field tested on a number of school board members and prospective school board members from the East Tennessee area. Validation was the major objective.

Chapter 4

DATA AND FINDINGS

The problem of this study was to develop a preservice training program for prospective board of education members. The program was also developed to be of appropriate use by board members already serving. The problem was divided into components in order to facilitate the identification of the many aspects involved. The subproblems were:

1. To determine if Tennessee and Tennessee's bordering states have preservice or inservice training programs for school board members.
2. To determine the qualifications for serving as a school board member in Tennessee and in Tennessee's bordering states.
3. To determine if some type of preservice training should be required of all prospective school board members.
4. To determine the types of activities a school board member should be familiar with before assuming his job.
5. To determine what a preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members should consist of and based on their needs to develop such a training program.
6. To field test the preservice and/or inservice training program with a group of school board members and prospective school board members.

From the above problem and subproblems, the questions presented in Chapter 1 were formulated. Chapter 4 presents the data

collected and the results of this investigation as they related to the problem and subproblems and the questions developed earlier.

SCHOOL SYSTEMS INVOLVED IN STUDY

The focal point of this study was the state of Tennessee. Specifically, the study concentrated on the 146 school systems in the state. The public school system in Tennessee consists of ninety-five county school systems, thirty-seven city and town school systems, and fourteen special school systems. All 146 systems were included in the study in an effort to get a more complete picture of the situation.

QUESTIONNAIRE TO SUPERINTENDENTS, BOARD CHAIRMEN, AND SELECTED BOARD MEMBERS

One of the major sources of information for the study was a Questionnaire constructed by the investigator. The Questionnaire was sent to the superintendents and board chairmen of the 146 school systems in Tennessee as well as being sent to one board member other than the board chairmen from each of the 146 systems. These latter recipients were selected at random by using a table of random numbers. A copy of the Questionnaire and cover letter can be found in Appendix A.

A total of 438 Questionnaires were sent--146 to superintendents, 146 to board chairmen, and 146 to selected board members. After a number of weeks, a follow-up letter was sent to each of these individuals (Appendix B). It was necessary to send follow-up letters to all 438 recipients of the Questionnaire because the respondents were not required or asked to sign their names or even signify the school system with which they were connected. They were only asked

to designate whether they were a superintendent, a board chairman, or a regular board member.

In the proposal for this study, a return of 70 percent of the Questionnaires was considered to be acceptable. Of the 438 Questionnaires sent, 394 were returned for a return of 90.0 percent. Of the 146 Questionnaires sent to superintendents, 135 of these were returned for a 93.2 percent return, while board chairmen in the 146 Tennessee school systems also received Questionnaires, and 128 of these were completed and returned. This provided an 87.7 percent return. Finally, 146 randomly selected board members, excluding the board chairman from each school system, received Questionnaires. Of these, 131 were completed and returned for a return of 89.7 percent. The above data are found in Table 1, page 57.

As was stated above, a total of 394 Questionnaires were completed and returned. Of these 394 Questionnaires, 135 or 34.3 percent were returned by superintendents, 128 or 32.5 percent were returned by board chairmen, and 131 or 33.2 percent were returned by regular board members. These data are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2

Number and Percent of the 394 Questionnaires Returned That Were Completed by Superintendents, Board Chairmen, and Selected Board Members

	Number	Percent
Superintendents	135	34.3
Board Chairmen	128	32.5
Selected Board Members	131	33.2
TOTAL	394	100.0

Table 1
Number and Percentage of Questionnaires Completed and Returned

Total		Superintendents			Board Chairmen			Selected Board Members		
Number Sent	Number Received	Number Sent	Number Received	Percent	Number Sent	Number Received	Percent	Number Sent	Number Received	Percent
438	394	146	135	93.2	146	128	87.7	146	131	89.7

The first question of the Questionnaire asked, "Do you feel board members in your school system should receive better orientation for their jobs?" Of those who answered, 95.7 percent said "yes," 2.0 percent said "no," and 2.3 percent said "not sure." Among superintendents only, 97.8 percent answered "yes," 1.5 percent answered "no," and 0.7 percent answered "not sure." Among board chairmen, 94.5 percent answered "yes," 3.9 percent answered "no," and 1.6 percent answered "not sure." Regular board members answered 94.7 percent as "yes," 0.7 percent as "no," and 4.6 percent as "not sure." Table 3 summarizes this information. It was definitely concluded, based on the findings, that the respondents strongly felt that board members should receive better orientation in order to function affectively.

Question 2 of the Questionnaire asked, "Where do you feel a board member orientation program should be held?" Out of a total of 394 Questionnaires completed, 46.7 percent answered "a university," 20.1 percent answered "a public school," 27.4 percent answered "central office," 5.8 percent answered "other." A total of 39.3 percent of the superintendents answered "a university" to this question, 23.7 percent answered "a public school," 31.1 percent answered "central office," and 5.9 percent answered "other." Among board chairmen, 48.4 percent felt "a university" was the best place to conduct a board member orientation program, 17.1 percent indicated "a public school" as their preference, 28.1 percent marked "central office," and 6.4 percent answered "other." Regular board members answered this question by marking 52.7 percent as "a university," 19.1 percent as "a public school," 22.9 percent as "central office," and 5.3 percent as "other." Table 4 contains the data on the second question of the

Table 3

Do You Feel Board Members in Your System Should Receive Better
Orientation for Their Jobs?

Possible Answers	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairmen		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	377	95.7	132	97.8	121	94.5	124	94.7
No	8	2.0	2	1.5	5	3.9	1	0.7
Not Sure	9	2.3	1	0.7	2	1.6	6	4.6
TOTAL	394	100.0	135	100.0	128	100.0	131	100.0

Table 4
Where Do You Feel A Board Member Orientation Program
Should Be Held?

Possible Answers	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairmen		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A university	184	46.7	53	39.3	62	48.4	69	52.7
A public school	79	20.1	32	23.7	22	17.1	25	19.1
Central office	108	27.4	42	31.1	36	28.1	30	22.9
Other	23	5.8	8	5.9	8	6.4	7	5.3
TOTAL	394	100.0	135	100.0	128	100.0	131	100.0

Questionnaire. From the findings of the study it appeared that the best place for holding a board member training program was at a college or university.

"By whom do you feel the board member orientation program should be conducted?" was the third question on the Questionnaire. From the total Questionnaires completed and returned, 21.6 percent answered "superintendent," 13.5 percent answered "board chairman," 15.5 percent answered "both superintendent and board chairman," 24.9 percent answered "state school boards association," 4.8 percent answered "national school boards association," 17.5 percent answered "state department of education," and 2.2 percent answered "other." Among superintendents, 28.1 percent answered "superintendent," 15.6 percent answered "board chairman," 19.3 percent answered "both superintendent and board chairman," 6.7 percent answered "state school boards association," 2.9 percent answered "national school boards association," 26.7 percent answered "state department of education," and 0.7 percent answered "other." Among board chairmen, 22.7 percent answered "superintendent," 14.8 percent answered "board chairman," 17.2 percent answered "both superintendent and board chairman," 23.4 percent answered "state school boards association," 3.1 percent answered "national school boards association," 16.4 percent answered "state department of education," and 2.4 percent answered "other." Among regular board members, 13.7 percent answered "superintendent," 9.9 percent answered "board chairman," 9.9 percent answered "both superintendent and board chairman," 45.0 percent answered "state school boards association," 8.4 percent answered "national school boards association," 9.2 percent answered "state department of education,"

and 3.9 percent answered "other." The above data can be found in Table 5. Based upon the findings of the study, the state school boards association appeared to be the best choice for carrying out the board member training program.

Question 4 inquired, "What type of speakers should be used in a board member orientation program?" Out of the 394 Questionnaires returned, 22.8 percent answered "lay," 51.5 percent answered "professional," and 25.7 percent answered "both lay and professional." Among superintendents, 17.0 percent answered "lay," 55.6 percent answered "professional," and 27.4 percent answered "both lay and professional." Among board chairmen, 29.7 percent answered "lay," 46.1 percent answered "professional," and 24.2 percent answered "both lay and professional." Among regular board members, 22.2 percent answered "lay," 52.7 percent answered "professional," and 25.1 percent answered "both lay and professional." Table 6 contains the above data. As for the type of speakers to be used in the board member training program, the overwhelming choice of the respondents to the Questionnaire was to use professional speakers.

Question 5 of the Questionnaire asked, "When do you feel the board member orientation program should be offered?" Of the 394 individuals who responded, 36.5 percent answered "before election or appointment," 32.7 percent answered "just before taking office," 26.8 percent answered "just after taking office," and 4.0 percent answered "other." From superintendents, 31.9 percent answered "before election or appointment," 25.9 percent answered "just before taking office," 37.8 percent answered "just after taking office," and 4.4 percent answered "other." Among board chairmen, 30.5 percent answered "before

Table 5

By Whom Do You Feel the Board Member Orientation Program
Should be Conducted?

Possible Answers	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairman		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Superinten- dent	85	21.6	38	28.1	29	22.7	18	13.7
Board Chairman	53	13.5	21	15.6	19	14.8	13	9.9
Both Superin- tendent and Board Chairman	61	15.5	26	19.3	22	17.2	13	9.9
State School Boards Association	98	24.9	9	6.7	30	23.4	59	45.0
National School Boards Association	19	4.8	4	2.9	4	3.1	11	8.4

Table 5 (continued)

Possible Answers	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairmen		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
State Depart- ment of Education	69	17.5	36	26.7	21	16.4	12	9.2
Other	9	2.2	1	0.7	3	2.4	5	3.9
TOTAL	394	100.0	135	100.0	128	100.0	131	100.0

Table 6
What Type of Speakers Should Be Used in a Board Member Orientation Program?

Possible Answers	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairmen		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Lay	90	22.8	23	17.0	38	29.7	29	22.2
Professional	203	51.5	75	55.6	59	46.1	69	52.7
Both lay and professional	101	25.7	37	27.4	31	24.2	33	25.1
TOTAL	394	100.0	135	100.0	128	100.0	131	100.0

election or appointment," 34.4 percent answered "just before taking office," 29.7 percent answered "just after taking office," and 5.4 percent answered "other." Of the selected board members, 47.3 percent answered "before election or appointment," 38.2 percent answered "just before taking office," 13.0 percent answered "just after taking office," and 1.5 percent answered "other." This data are summarized in Table 7. According to the findings of the study, the board member training program should begin as early as possible--before election or appointment if it were feasible to do so.

Question 6 of the Questionnaire asked, "How long should the board member orientation program last?" Of the 394 Questionnaires completed and returned, 13.7 percent answered "a few hours," 10.4 percent answered "a day," 12.2 percent answered "a week," 15.2 percent answered "a month," and 48.5 percent answered "other." Among superintendents, 10.4 percent answered "a few hours," 7.4 percent answered "a day," 11.1 percent answered "a week," 20.0 percent answered "a month," and 51.1 percent answered "other." From board chairmen, 18.0 percent answered "a few hours," 14.8 percent answered "a day," 13.3 percent answered "a week," 10.9 percent answered "a month," and 43.0 percent answered "other." Of regular board members, 13.0 percent answered "a few hours," 9.2 percent answered "a day," 12.2 percent answered "a week," 14.5 percent answered "a month," and 51.1 percent answered "other." A better picture of these data can be found in Table 8. On question 6 nearly one half of the respondents marked "other" for their answer. As a result, the answer for this question was decided by the responses given under the "other" heading. By far, the response most frequently given was "continuous." Therefore, the findings of

Table 7
When Do You Feel the Board Member Orientation Program Should Be Offered?

Possible Answers	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairmen		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Before elec- tion or appointment	144	36.5	43	31.9	39	30.5	62	47.3
Just before taking office	129	32.7	35	25.9	44	34.4	50	38.2
Just after taking office	106	26.8	51	37.8	38	29.7	17	13.0
Other	15	4.0	6	4.4	7	5.4	2	1.5
TOTAL	394	100.0	135	100.0	128	100.0	131	100.0

Table 8
How Long Should the Board Member Orientation Program Last?

Possible Answers	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairmen		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
A few hours	54	13.7	14	10.4	23	18.0	17	13.0
A day	41	10.4	10	7.4	19	14.8	12	9.2
A week	48	12.2	15	11.1	17	13.3	16	12.2
A month	60	15.2	27	20.0	14	10.9	19	14.5
Other	191	48.5	69	51.1	55	43.0	67	51.1
TOTAL	394	100.0	135	100.0	128	100.0	131	100.0

the study strongly pointed toward the need for a board member training program that is continuous in nature.

Number 7 on the Questionnaire directed the respondents to, "Number the following areas in order of importance as far as consideration for a board member orientation program is concerned." When looking at first place votes only, "school finance" received the most by polling 25.9 percent of all first place votes. "School law" received the second largest number of first place votes with 22.3 percent of the total number of first place votes. "Policies of the school system" received the third largest number of first place votes with 16.0 percent. "School buildings and equipment" received the fourth largest number of first place votes with 14.0 percent. "Curriculum and instruction" received the fifth largest number of first place votes with 10.4 percent. "Public or human relations" received the sixth largest number of first place votes with 5.1 percent. "Interest groups" received the seventh largest number of first place votes with 2.3 percent. Lastly, 4.0 percent cast their first place vote for some topic other than the seven listed above. This 4.0 percent can be found under the "other" heading.

Of 135 superintendents who responded to question 7, 25.9 percent marked "school law" as their first choice, 25.2 percent marked "school finance," 14.8 percent marked "curriculum and instruction," 12.6 percent marked "policies of the school system" 11.1 percent marked "school buildings and equipment," 4.4 percent marked "public or human relations," 4.4 percent marked "other," and 1.6 percent marked "interest groups." Among board chairmen, 28.9 percent marked "school finance" as their first choice, 20.3 percent marked "policies

of the school system" 18.8 percent marked "school law," 14.8 percent marked "school buildings and equipment," 7.0 percent marked "curriculum and instruction," 3.9 percent marked "other," and 2.4 percent marked "interest groups." Among regular board members, 23.7 percent marked "school finance" as their first choice, 22.1 percent marked "school law," 16.0 percent marked "school buildings and equipment," 15.3 percent marked "policies of the school system" 9.1 percent marked "curriculum and instruction," 6.9 percent marked "public or human relations," 3.8 percent marked "other," and 3.1 percent marked "interest groups." The above data on question 7 are summarized in Table 9.

Table 10 shows the ranking of topics in question 7 when they were put in order from the one which received the most support from the respondents to the one receiving the least support. To do this a point system had to be devised. It was decided by the investigator to give eight points for each first place vote, seven for each second, six for each third, five for each fourth, four for each fifth, three for each sixth, two for each seventh, and one for each eighth. The only difference between the rankings using this method and the one considering only the first place votes was that "school buildings and equipment" and "curriculum and instruction" changed places in the two. When looking at first place votes only, "school buildings and equipment" ranked fourth and "curriculum and instruction" ranked fifth. Just the opposite was true when all votes or tallies were considered. "Curriculum and instruction" ranked fourth and "school buildings and equipment" ranked fifth when the latter method was used. When looking at the results of these two processes, it became quite apparent which

Table 9

Number and Percent of First Place Votes Only on Question 7 of Questionnaire

Choices	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairmen		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
School finance	102	25.9	34	25.2	37	28.9	31	23.7
School law	88	22.3	35	25.9	24	18.8	29	22.1
Policies of the school system	63	16.0	17	12.6	26	20.3	20	15.3
School buildings and equipment	55	14.0	15	11.1	19	14.8	21	16.0
Curriculum and instruction	41	10.4	20	14.8	9	7.0	12	9.1
Public or human relations	20	5.1	6	4.4	5	3.9	9	6.9
Interest groups	9	2.3	2	1.6	3	2.4	4	3.1
Other	16	4.0	6	4.4	5	3.9	5	3.8
TOTAL	394	100.0	135	100.0	128	100.0	131	100.0

topics the respondents to the Questionnaire emphasized the most for the board member training program.

Table 10
Ranking of Topics When All Votes Were Considered
on Question 7 of Questionnaire

Choices	Total Points*
School finance	2,457
School law	2,329
Policies of the school system	2,211
Curriculum and instruction	1,977
School buildings and equipment	1,929
Public or human relations	1,449
Interest groups	1,315
Other	165

*Eight points for each first place vote, seven for each second, . . . , one for each eighth.

Asked by question number 8 of the Questionnaire was, "Does your school system have orientation programs for new school board members?" Out of 394 individuals who responded to the Questionnaire, 8.4 percent answered "yes," 71.8 percent answered "no," and 19.8 percent answered "an informal one." Among superintendents, 9.6 percent answered "yes," 72.6 percent answered "no," and 17.8 percent answered "an informal one." Among board chairmen, 12.5 percent answered "yes," 55.5 percent answered "no," and 32.0 percent answered "an informal one." Among selected board members, 2.1 percent answered "yes," 87.0 percent answered "no," and 9.9 percent answered "an informal one." It was quite apparent from these figures that the majority of the school systems in the state had no orientation program for their new board members, or at the best, an informal one. This data is summarized

in Table 11.

Question 9 of the Questionnaire asked, "Is your school system's orientation program for school board members considered comprehensive or less than that?" Out of the 394 Questionnaires returned, 2.3 percent answered "comprehensive," 10.9 percent answered "adequate," 6.6 percent answered "minimum," 8.4 percent answered "insufficient," and 71.8 percent answered "none." Among superintendents, 2.2 percent answered "comprehensive," 10.4 percent answered "adequate," 8.1 percent answered "minimum," 6.7 percent answered "insufficient," and 72.6 percent answered "none." Among board chairmen, 3.9 percent answered "comprehensive," 18.8 percent answered "adequate," 9.4 percent answered "minimum," 12.4 percent answered "insufficient," and 55.5 percent answered "none." Among regular board members, 0.8 percent answered "comprehensive," 3.8 percent answered "adequate," 2.3 percent answered "minimum," 6.1 percent answered "insufficient," and 87.0 percent answered "none." Based upon the answers to question 9, it was most obvious that the majority of the school systems in Tennessee either had no orientation program for school board members or the one they had was something less than comprehensive. This information is summarized in Table 12.

Number 10 on the Questionnaire directed the respondents to, "Indicate the items that are used in your orientation program for new board members (if your school system has such a program)." This question was then divided into five parts. The respondents marked the appropriate items under each part. On the first section, they could have marked as many items under each section as applied to their particular situation. This could have been all of the items or none of

Table 11
Does Your School System Have Orientation Programs for New School
Board Members?

Possible Answers	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairmen		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	33	8.4	13	9.6	16	12.5	4	3.1
No	283	71.8	98	72.6	71	55.5	114	87.0
An informal one	78	19.8	24	17.8	41	32.0	13	9.9
TOTAL	394	100.0	135	100.0	128	100.0	131	100.0

Table 12
Is Your School System's Orientation Program for School Board Members
Considered Comprehensive or Less Than That?

Possible Answers	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairmen		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Comprehensive	9	2.3	3	2.2	5	3.9	1	0.8
Adequate	43	10.9	14	10.4	24	18.8	5	3.8
Minimum	26	6.6	11	8.1	12	9.4	3	2.3
Insufficient	33	8.4	9	6.7	16	12.4	8	6.1
None	283	71.8	98	72.6	71	55.5	114	87.0
TOTAL	394	100.0	135	100.0	128	100.0	131	100.0

the items. Of 394 persons who returned the Questionnaire, 283 or 71.8 percent either left question 10 blank or wrote "none" or a similar answer after the question. This corresponded to the number of respondents who answered "no" to question 8. This meant that 111 or 28.2 percent of the respondents to the Questionnaire either partially or completely answered question 10. Out of the 111 persons who responded to number 10 of the Questionnaire, 37 or 33.3 percent were superintendents, 57 or 51.4 percent were board chairmen, and 17 or 15.3 percent were regular board members.

The first part of question 10, section A, was entitled "reading materials." Since this section of question 10 differed in nature so much from the questions dealt with up to this point, it was necessary to handle the data in a different manner. This resulted from the fact that the respondents could mark none, one, two, or all of the items under this section. All the previously dealt with questions of the Questionnaire, with the exception of number 7, required a single answer from the respondents on each question. Therefore, it was apparent that the numbers for part A of question 10 or for any part of the question would not add up to 111 nor would the percentages total 100 percent. For this reason, it was decided to consider each item under this section separately. No attempt was made to compare nor add the results of or the answers to the various items.

The first item under "reading materials" was "school regulations." Of the 111 persons who responded to question 10, 78.4 percent checked "school regulations." This item was marked by 75.7 percent of the 37 superintendents who answered the question, 78.9 percent of the 57 board chairmen who answered the question, and 82.4 percent

of the 17 regular board members who responded to the question.

The second item included under "reading materials" was "school board policy guide" which was marked by 86.5 percent of the 111 respondents to question 10. Among the 37 superintendents who responded to this question, 83.8 percent marked this item, 87.7 percent of the board chairmen marked it, and 88.2 percent of the regular board members checked it.

Item number three under "reading materials" was "minutes of board meetings" which was marked by 80.2 percent of the 111 respondents to question 10. This item was marked by 78.4 percent of the 37 superintendents who answered question 10, 80.7 percent of the 57 board chairmen who answered the question, and 82.4 percent of the 17 regular board members who responded to the question.

The fourth item considered under part A of question 10 was "literature from school board associations" which was marked by 72.1 percent of the 111 respondents to question 10. This item was checked by 70.3 percent of the 37 superintendents who answered question 10, 73.7 percent of the 57 board chairmen who answered the question, and 70.6 percent of the 17 regular board members who responded to the question.

A fifth item noted as "reading materials" was "commercial sources" which was marked by 25.2 percent of the 111 persons who answered question 10. This item was marked by 27.0 percent of the 37 superintendents who answered question 10, 22.8 percent of the 57 board chairmen who answered the question, and 29.4 percent of the 17 regular board members who responded to the question.

Item number six under "reading materials" was "board reports,

curriculum and budgetary materials" which was checked by 70.3 percent of the 111 persons who answered question 10. This item was checked by 67.6 percent of the 37 superintendents who answered question 10, 70.2 percent of the 57 board chairmen who answered the question, and 76.5 percent of the 17 regular board members who answered the question.

The seventh item under the heading of part A of question 10 was "state codes" which was checked by 30.6 percent of the 111 respondents answering question 10. This item was checked by 32.4 percent of the 37 superintendents who answered question 10, 29.8 percent of the 57 board chairmen who answered the question, and 29.4 percent of the 17 regular board members who responded to the question.

The eighth item considered under "reading materials" was "seminars" which was marked by 20.7 percent of the 111 persons who answered question 10. This item was checked by 21.6 percent of the 37 superintendents who answered question 10, 21.1 percent of the 57 board chairmen who answered the question, and 17.7 percent of the 17 regular board members who answered the question.

Item number nine listed under "reading materials" was "group sessions" which was checked by 58.6 percent of the 111 persons who responded to question 10. This item was checked by 59.5 percent of the 37 superintendents who answered question 10, 59.6 percent of the 57 board chairmen who answered the question, and 52.9 percent of the 17 regular board members who answered the question.

The final item included under part A, "reading materials," of question 10 was "other" which was marked by 0.9 percent of the 111 persons who responded to question 10. This item was checked by 2.7 percent of the 37 superintendents who answered question 10, 0.0 percent

of the 57 board chairmen who answered the question, and 0.0 percent of the 17 regular board members who answered the question. The data from this part of question 10 are summarized in Table 13.

Part B of question 10 was entitled "a private conference in which problems and issues are covered." This section of the question, unlike part A, was similar in nature to most of the previous questions on the Questionnaire. Therefore, it was decided to handle it in a similar manner. Of 111 persons who responded to this part of question 10, 34.2 percent answered "with the superintendent," 18.0 percent answered "with the board chairman," 27.9 percent answered "with both the superintendent and the board chairman," 3.6 percent answered "with a staff member below the rank of superintendent," 9.0 percent answered "with a board member other than the board chairman," and 7.3 percent answered "other." Among the 37 superintendents who answered this question, 32.4 percent answered "with the superintendent," 18.9 percent answered "with the board chairman," 27.0 percent answered "with both the superintendent and the board chairman," 2.7 percent answered "with a staff member below the rank of superintendent," 8.2 percent answered "with a board member other than the board chairman," and 10.8 percent answered "other." Of the 57 board chairmen who answered this question, 35.1 percent answered "with the superintendent," 19.3 percent answered "with the board chairman," 29.8 percent answered "with both the superintendent and the board chairman," 3.5 percent answered "with a staff member below the rank of superintendent," 8.8 percent answered "with a board member other than the board chairman," and 3.5 percent answered "other." Of the 17 regular board members who answered this question, 35.3 percent responded "with the super-

Table 13

Number and Percent of the 111 Persons Answering Question 10 of the Questionnaire
Who Responded to Part A Entitled "Reading Materials"

Possible Answers	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairmen		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent of 111	Number	Percent of 37	Number	Percent of 57	Number	Percent of 17
School regulations	87	78.4	28	75.7	45	78.9	14	82.4
School board policy guide	96	86.5	31	83.8	50	87.7	15	88.2
Minutes of board meetings	89	80.2	29	78.4	46	80.7	14	82.4
Literature of school boards associations	80	72.1	26	70.3	42	73.7	12	70.6
Commercial sources	28	25.2	10	27.0	13	22.8	5	29.4
Board Reports, Curriculum and Budgetary Materials	78	70.3	25	67.6	40	70.2	13	76.5

Table 13 (continued)

Possible Answers	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairmen		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent of 111	Number	Percent of 37	Number	Percent of 57	Number	Percent of 17
State codes	34	30.6	12	32.4	17	29.8	5	29.4
Seminars	23	20.7	8	21.6	12	21.1	3	17.7
Group Sessions	65	58.6	22	59.5	34	59.6	9	52.9
Other	1	0.9	1	2.7	0	0.0	0	0.0

intendent," 11.8 percent answered "with the board chairman," 23.5 percent answered "with both the superintendent and board chairman," 5.8 percent answered "with a staff member below the rank of superintendent," 11.8 percent answered "with a board member other than the board chairman," and 11.8 percent answered "other." This information is summarized in Table 14.

Part C of question 10 was entitled "visits to the school system's offices and schools." Out of 111 persons who responded to this part of question 10, 39.6 percent answered "with the superintendent," 13.5 percent answered "with the board chairman," 42.3 percent answered "with other board members, a principal or a central staff employee," and 4.6 percent answered "other." Among the 37 superintendents who answered this question, 48.7 percent answered "with the superintendent," 10.8 percent answered "with the board chairman," 37.8 percent answered "with other board members, a principal, or a central staff employee," and 2.7 percent answered "other." Of the 57 board chairmen who answered this question, 35.1 percent answered "with the superintendent," 14.0 percent answered "with the board chairman," 47.4 percent answered "with other board members, a principal, or a central staff employee," and 3.5 percent answered "other." Of the 17 regular board members who answered this question, 35.3 percent responded "with the superintendent," 17.6 percent answered "with the board chairman," 35.3 percent answered "with other board members, a principal, or a central staff employee," and 11.8 percent answered "other." This information can be found in Table 15.

Part D of question 10 was entitled "a letter of welcome and congratulations." Out of 111 persons who responded to this part of

Table 14

Number and Percent of Respondents Answering Question 10B of Questionnaire Which Was Entitled "a Private Conference in Which Problems and Issues Are Covered"

Possible Answers	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairmen		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
With the superintendent	38	34.2	12	32.4	20	35.1	6	35.3
With the board chairman	20	18.0	7	18.9	11	19.3	2	11.8
With both the superintendent and board chairman	31	27.9	10	27.0	17	29.8	4	23.5
With a staff member below the rank of superintendent	4	3.6	1	2.7	2	3.5	1	5.8
With a board member other than the board chairman	10	9.0	3	8.2	5	8.8	2	11.8
Other	8	7.3	4	10.8	2	3.5	2	11.8
TOTAL	111	100.0	37	100.0	57	100.0	17	100.0

Table 15

Number and Percent of Respondents Answering Question 10C of Questionnaire Which Was
Entitled "Visits to the School System's Offices and Schools"

Possible Answers	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairmen		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
With the super- intendent	44	39.6	18	48.7	20	35.1	6	35.3
With the board chairman	15	13.5	4	10.8	8	14.0	3	17.6
With other board members, a principal, or a central staff employee	47	42.3	14	37.8	27	47.4	6	35.3
Other	5	4.6	1	2.7	2	3.5	2	11.8
TOTAL	111	100.0	37	100.0	57	100.0	17	100.0

question 10, 49.5 percent answered "from the superintendent," 42.3 percent answered "from the board chairman," and 8.2 percent answered "other." Among the 37 superintendents who answered this question, 51.4 percent answered "from the superintendent," 37.8 percent answered "from the board chairman," and 10.8 percent answered "other." Of the 57 board chairmen who answered this question, 54.5 percent answered "from the superintendent," 43.9 percent answered "from the board chairman," and 1.7 percent answered "other." From the 17 regular board members who answered this question, 29.4 percent answered "from the superintendent," 47.1 percent answered "from the board chairman," and 23.5 percent answered "other." This information is summarized in Table 16.

Question 11 of the Questionnaire asked, "When does the new board member receive his orientation (if your school system has such a program)?" Out of 111 persons who responded to this question (which corresponded to the number of persons who answered "yes" or "an informal one" to question 8), 3.6 percent answered "before taking office," 80.2 percent answered "after taking office," and 16.2 percent answered "before and after taking office." Among the 37 superintendents who answered this question, 0.0 percent answered "before taking office," 91.8 percent answered "after taking office," and 8.2 percent answered "before and after taking office." Among the 57 board chairmen who answered this question, 5.3 percent answered "before taking office," 78.9 percent answered "after taking office," and 15.8 percent answered "before and after taking office." Among the 17 regular board members who answered this question, 5.8 percent answered "before taking office," 58.9 percent answered "after taking office,"

Table 16

Number and Percent of Respondents Answering Question 10D of Questionnaire
Which Was Entitled "a Letter of Welcome and Congratulations"

Possible Answers	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairmen		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
From the super- intendent	55	49.5	19	51.4	31	54.4	5	29.4
From the board chairman	47	42.3	14	37.8	25	43.9	8	47.1
Other	9	8.2	4	10.8	1	1.7	4	23.5
TOTAL	111	100.0	37	100.0	57	100.0	17	100.0

and 35.3 percent answered "before and after taking office." According to the respondents to the Questionnaire, the great majority of new board members received their orientation after taking office. This information is summarized in Table 17.

Question 12 of the Questionnaire inquired, "Who carries out the orientation of the new board member (if your school system has an orientation program)?" Out of 111 persons who responded to this question (which again corresponded to the number of persons who answered "yes" or "an informal one" to question 8), 38.7 percent answered "both the board chairman and superintendent," 17.1 percent answered "the superintendent," 15.3 percent answered "the board chairman," 0.0 percent answered "board secretary," 4.6 percent answered "county and state staff," 9.9 percent answered "other board members," 6.2 percent answered "a principal," and 8.2 percent answered "other." Of the 37 superintendents who answered this question, 37.8 percent answered "both the board chairman and superintendent," 16.2 percent answered "the superintendent," 10.8 percent answered "the board chairman," 0.0 percent answered "board secretary," 8.2 percent answered "county and state staff," 10.8 percent answered "other board members," 5.4 percent answered "a principal," and 10.8 percent answered "other." Among the 57 board chairmen who answered this question, 36.8 percent answered "both the board chairman and superintendent," 17.5 percent answered "the superintendent," 19.3 percent answered "the board chairman," 0.0 percent answered "board secretary," 3.5 percent answered "county and state staff," 10.5 percent answered "other board members," 7.1 percent answered "a principal," and 5.3 percent answered "other." From the 17 regular board members who answered the question, 47.1 percent answered

Table 17

When Does the New Board Member Receive His Orientation
(If Your School System Has Such a Program)?

Possible Answers	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairmen		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Before taking office	4	3.6	0	0.0	3	5.3	1	5.8
After taking office	89	80.2	34	91.8	45	78.9	10	58.9
Before and after taking office	18	16.2	3	8.2	9	15.8	6	35.3
TOTAL	111	100.0	37	100.0	57	100.0	17	100.0

"both the board chairman and superintendent," 17.7 percent answered "the superintendent," 11.8 percent answered "the board chairman," 0.0 percent answered "the board secretary," 0.0 percent answered "county and state staff," 5.8 percent answered "other board members," 5.8 percent answered "a principal," and 11.8 percent answered "other." Based on the responses to question 12, both the board chairman and superintendent most commonly were the ones who carried out the orientation of the new board member. This information is summarized in Table 18.

Asked by question 13 of the Questionnaire was, "Do you feel that some type of preservice orientation program should be required of all prospective school board members?" Of the 394 persons who completed and returned the Questionnaires, 23.6 percent answered "yes" and 76.4 percent answered "no." Among the 135 superintendents who responded to the question, 35.6 percent answered "yes" and 64.4 percent answered "no." From the 128 board chairmen who answered the question, 15.6 percent answered "yes" and 84.4 percent answered "no." Of the 131 regular board members who answered the question, 19.1 percent answered "yes" and 80.9 percent answered "no." Based upon the answers to this question, it was quite apparent that the overwhelming majority of the respondents to the Questionnaire were against requiring prospective school board members to participate in some type of preservice orientation program. This information is summarized in Table 19. However, it should be pointed out that several of those persons who answered "no" to question 13 added that they felt such a program should be offered and that board members should be encouraged to take part but on a voluntary basis.

Question 14 of the Questionnaire asked, "If you were orienting

Table 18

Who Carries Out the Orientation of the New Board Member
(If Your School System Has an Orientation Program)?

Possible Answers	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairmen		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Both the board chair- man and super- intendent	43	38.7	14	37.8	21	36.8	8	47.1
The super- intendent	19	17.1	6	16.2	10	17.5	3	17.7
The board chairman	17	15.3	4	10.8	11	19.3	2	11.8
Board secre- tary	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
County and state staff	5	4.6	3	8.2	2	3.5	0	0.0
Other board members	11	9.9	4	10.8	6	10.5	1	5.8
A principal	7	6.2	2	5.4	4	7.1	1	5.8
Other	9	8.2	4	10.8	3	5.3	2	11.8
TOTAL	111	100.0	37	100.0	57	100.0	17	100.0

Table 19

Do You Feel That Some Type of Preservice Orientation Program Should
Be Required of All Prospective School Board Members?

Possible Answers	Total		Superintendents		Board Chairmen		Selected Board Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Yes	93	23.6	48	35.6	20	15.6	25	19.1
No	301	76.4	87	64.4	108	84.4	106	80.9
TOTAL	394	100.0	135	100.0	128	100.0	131	100.0

a new board member, what would you emphasize to him as being most important? (Please list and circle whether you are a superintendent, a board chairman, or a regular board member. If additional room is needed, please use back of sheet.)" As has already been indicated, a total of 394 Questionnaires were completed and returned. Of these Questionnaires, 34.3 percent were returned by superintendents, 32.5 percent were returned by board chairmen, and 33.2 percent were returned by regular board members. The superintendents, board chairmen, and regular board members suggested a myriad of individual opinions for emphasis in orienting new board members.

It was interesting to note certain contradictions between what the respondents to the Questionnaire felt should be presented and what actually existed. For example, question 3 asked the respondents to indicate whom they felt should conduct the board member orientation program. Although the answers were somewhat varied among several choices, more persons marked the "state school boards association" than any other single answer. Yet in question 12, when those persons who had such a program in their school system were asked to indicate who actually carried out the orientation of the new board member, by far the largest number of respondents marked "both the board chairman and superintendent."

Another such example appeared when the answers to question 5 and question 11 were compared. Question 5 asked the respondents to indicate when they felt the board member orientation program should be offered. The answers to this question obviously indicated the respondents' preference for offering such a program as early as possible--even before election or appointment if feasible. Yet in

question 11, when those persons whose school systems had an orientation program were asked when the new board member actually received his orientation, approximately eight out of ten persons answered "after taking office." This information is summarized in Table 20.

STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION AND STATE SCHOOL
BOARDS ASSOCIATIONS INVOLVED IN STUDY

As was stated previously the state of Tennessee was the focal point of the study. It was felt, however, that additional valuable information could be obtained by including Tennessee's border states in the study. As a result, a letter of inquiry (Appendix C) was prepared and sent to the state departments of education and state school boards associations in Tennessee and in Tennessee's eight bordering states. These eight border states are: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, and Virginia.

The three major types of information sought by means of this letter were as follows: what the qualifications were for becoming a school board member in the nine states mentioned above, specifically, whether any of them required prospective or new board members to participate in any type of training program either before or after being elected or appointed to their positions; information concerning preservice or inservice training programs for school board members as they existed, if at all, in these nine states; and, finally, information or suggestions as to what things should be included in a training program for school board members. The next section of the study deals with the information and data obtained through responses to the letter of inquiry sent to the state school boards associations and state

Table 20

Contradictions Revealed by Questionnaire Between What the Respondents
Felt Should Be and What Actually Existed

Questions	Should Be	Actually Existed
Who should conduct the board member orientation program?	State school boards association (question 3)	Both the board chairman and superintendent (question 12)
When should the board member orientation program be offered?	As early as possible-even before election or appointment if feasible (question 5)	After taking office (question 11)

departments of education in Tennessee and in Tennessee's eight bordering states.

LETTERS TO STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION AND STATE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATIONS

The letters of inquiry (Appendix C) sent to the state departments of education and state school boards associations in Tennessee and in Tennessee's eight border states returned a great deal of valuable information. It was necessary, however, to send a follow-up letter (Appendix D) to some of the recipients of the letter of inquiry. In the end, a response was received from the school boards associations and departments of education in all nine target states. This section of the study deals with each of the nine states individually and with the information collected from each state's department of education and school boards associations.

The first state to be discussed was Tennessee--the state around which the study focused. Tennessee law required that a school board member be a resident and voter of the county, city, or district in which he was elected, be a citizen of recognized integrity and intelligence, and have the ability to fulfill the duties of his office. It was required that he have a "practical education" and removal from the county, city, or special school district automatically relieved him of his office as a board member. A county board member could not be a member of the county court nor hold any other county office which paid a salary. There was no mention made of a requirement which stated that a new or prospective board member had to participate in a training program either before or after being elected or appointed to his position.

The second type of information sought by the letter concerned preservice or inservice training programs as they existed, if at all, in each state. Both the Tennessee Department of Education and the Tennessee School Boards Association reported that there was no formal program of preservice or inservice training for school board members in the state. However, the Tennessee School Boards Association did sponsor some seminars, conferences, and similar activities for school board members, and the Association's annual convention included a number of orientation and training opportunities for board members. From time to time, various school systems initiated their own orientation or training sessions. Sometimes more than one system would cooperate in such a venture.

The letter also sought suggestions as to what should be included in a training program for school board members. The following suggestions were made by the Tennessee Department of Education: the board member as a state official; school finance; curriculum and instruction; school law; school board-superintendent relations; school board-staff relations; and public relations. The Tennessee School Boards Association suggested the following topics for a school board training program: duties of board member; board policies; state rules and regulations; school law; school finance; public relations; curriculum and instruction; and buildings and equipment. The information obtained by means of the letter of inquiry from the Tennessee Department of Education and Tennessee School Boards Association is summarized in Table 21.

Alabama was the first border state of Tennessee to be considered. The Alabama state code stipulated that members of county and

Table 21

Information Concerning Tennessee Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State
Department of Education and State School Boards Association

Qualifications For School Board Member	Existing Preservice Or Inservice Training Programs	Suggestions For School Board Member Training Program
A resident and voter of the county, city, or district in which elected	No formal program of pre- service or inservice training for school board member in the state	Tennessee Department of Education: The board member as a state official School finance Curriculum and instruction School law School board-superintendent relations School board-staff relations Public relations
A citizen of recognized integrity and intelli- gence	Tennessee School Boards Association sponsors some seminars, conferences, and the like for school board members	
Ability to fulfill the duties of office	Tennessee School Boards Association's annual convention includes a number of orientation and training oppor- tunities for board members	Tennessee School Boards Association: Duties of board members Board policies State rules and regulations School law School finance Public relations Curriculum and instruction Buildings and equipment
"Practical education"		
Removal from county, city, or special school district automatically relieves one of office or board member		

Table 21 (Continued)

Qualifications For School Board Member	Existing Preservice Or Inservice Training Programs	Suggestions For School Board Member Training Program
County board member may not be a member of the county court or hold any other county office which pays a salary	From time to time, various school systems initiate their own orientation or training sessions and sometimes more than one system will cooperate on such a venture	
No mention of requirement saying new or prospective board member must take part in a training program either before or after being elected or appointed to position		

city boards of education had to be persons of good character who possessed an adequate elementary education. These were the only legal qualifications noted for school board members. Alabama did not require prospective or new board members to participate in any type of training program before or after their election or appointment.

The Alabama Department of Education reported that although it had no orientation or training program for school board members, the state did have a strong association of school boards and its meetings were conducted in such a way as to be of a workshop type where the participants could learn much about the proper functioning of local boards of education. The Alabama Association of School Boards stated that it normally conducted a statewide orientation program for new school board members. In addition, local school boards typically handled, through their administrative staffs, a program of orientation for newly elected or appointed school board members.

As for information concerning what should be included in a training program for school board members, the Alabama Department of Education referred this investigator to the Alabama Association of School Boards. The Association suggested the following for such a program: the board member as a state official; the board as a state agency; the board as a policy-making body; the budget; school finance; major board problems; board-staff relations; board-community relations; board-press relations; and school board problem solving. Table 22 summarizes the above information about the Alabama Department of Education and the Alabama Association of School Boards.

To qualify for school board membership in the state of Arkansas, a person had to be a bona fide resident of the district in which he or

Table 22

Information Concerning Alabama Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State
Department of Education and State School Boards Association

Qualifications For School Board Member	Existing Preservice Or Inservice Training Programs	Suggestions For School Board Member Training Program
Good character	Alabama School Boards Association conducts meetings in such a way as to be of a workshop type where the partici- pants can learn much about the proper func- tioning of local boards of education	Alabama Department of Education: Referred investigator to Alabama School Boards Association
Adequate elementary education		Alabama School Boards Association: The board member as a state official
Not require prospective or new board members to participate in any type of training program before or after election or appointment		The board as a state agency The board as a policy-making body The budget School finance Major board problems Board-staff relations Board-community relations Board-press relations School board problem solving
	Alabama School Boards Association normally conducts a statewide orientation program for new school board members	
	Local school boards typically handle, through their admin- istrative staffs, a program of orientation for newly elected or appointed school board members	

she wished to serve and a qualified elector of the district. A third requirement, that of ownership of property in the district, had been declared invalid by the Federal District Court. School board members were not required to participate in a preservice or inservice training program.

The Arkansas Department of Education itself did not have any type of orientation or training program for school board members, but it did cooperate in every way with the Arkansas School Boards Association. The Arkansas School Boards Association felt that a new school board member would take upon himself the responsibility of becoming informed on all aspects of the task he had undertaken. The Association felt, however, that this orientation of new members should not be left entirely to chance.

Most new members found themselves confronted with new and unfamiliar facts and conditions which led to the need for help that only experienced persons could provide. The phrase "learning on the job" accurately described the situation of most new school board members. Experience alone, however, could be a very slow teacher. An organized orientation program would shorten the time needed by new members to become functioning members of the school board team. Therefore, the Arkansas School Boards Association considered it to be the responsibility of the local superintendent and the experienced board members to formulate and carry out a program of orientation that would help a new board member to become acquainted with his role and his duties. To assist each school system in this undertaking, the Association published a handbook for Arkansas school board members entitled Effective School Board Membership. One section of the book dealt specifically

with the orientation and continuing education of school board members.

The Arkansas Department of Education suggested that all questions concerning information for a school board member training program be directed to the Arkansas School Boards Association. The Association made the following recommendations for items to include in such a program: public school organization; legal aspects of school board memberships; duties and responsibilities of school boards; the school budget; selecting a superintendent of schools; and providing an effective educational program. Further suggestions included: providing the necessary personnel; providing adequate physical facilities; developing and adopting board policy; the school board and the superintendent; the school board and the staff; the school board and the students; the school board and the community; utilizing the news media; the school board meeting; and records of meetings. The information provided by the Arkansas School Boards Association and the Arkansas Department of Education is organized and summarized in Table 23.

The Constitution of the state of Georgia defined the qualifications of members of local boards of education as such: "They shall elect men of good moral character, who shall have at least a fair knowledge of the elementary branches of an English education and be favorable to the common school system." The Georgia School Boards Association had no knowledge of any piece of legislation which addressed itself to other qualifications of local board members. There was no requirement for prospective or new board members to participate in any type of training program before or after being elected to their positions.

The Georgia Department of Education stated that the Georgia

Table 23

Information Concerning Arkansas Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State
Department of Education and State School Boards Association

Qualifications For School Board Member	Existing Preservice Or Inservice Training Programs	Suggestions For School Board Member Training Program
<p>A bona fide resident of the district in which one wishes to serve</p> <p>A qualified elector of the district</p> <p>A third requirement, that of ownership of property in the district has been declared invalid by the Federal District Court</p> <p>Not required to participate in a preservice or inservice training program</p>	<p>Arkansas School Boards Association feel it the responsibility of the local Superintendent and the experienced board members to formulate and carry out a program of orientation that will help a new board member to become acquainted with his role and his duties</p> <p>To assist each school system in this undertaking, the Arkansas School Boards Association publishes a handbook for Arkansas school board members entitled <u>Effective School Board Membership</u></p>	<p>Arkansas Department of Education: Referred investigator to Arkansas School Boards Association</p> <p>Arkansas School Boards Association: Public school organization Legal aspects of school board membership Duties and responsibilities of school boards The school budget Selecting a Superintendent of schools Providing an effective educational program Providing the necessary personnel Providing adequate physical facilities Developing and adopting board policy The school board and the superintendent</p>

PLEASE NOTE:

Some pages have print from
the preceding page showing
through. Filmed in the best
possible way.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.

School Boards Association provided board members with informational meetings to inform them of current school problems as well as laws and regulations that might affect their schools. The Georgia School Boards Association reported that it supplemented such preservice or inservice training as local board members received at the local level by sponsoring annually special clinics for new board members. Such training programs were made available to elected board members prior to assuming office and following their assumption of official duties. Appreciably good attendance was experienced at these clinics.

The Georgia Department of Education recommended that a training program for school board members should instruct board members in methods of developing school policies and permitting administrators to carry out the policies. Clinics sponsored by the Georgia School Boards Association were designed to develop competencies such as the following: understanding relationships between board members and the superintendent; setting of educational goals for the school program; understanding of the difference between "policy" and "administrative rules"; and knowledge and understanding of decision-making processes. Also included were: understanding relationships between board members and community; understanding relationships between board members and the staff; knowledge and understanding of fiscal and budgetary affairs; awareness of appropriate channels and lines of communication or authority in school board matters; and knowledge of legislation related to public school education. The Association emphasized that no one clinic could possibly embrace all categories important to school board members. In addition to these clinics, the Georgia School Boards Association sponsored follow-up meetings and informational releases in an attempt

to assist school board members in becoming well-rounded and generally effective board members. The above information collected from the Georgia School Boards Association and the Georgia Department of Education is summarized in Table 24.

The qualifications for becoming a school board member in Kentucky required that a person be at least twenty-four years old; have been a citizen of Kentucky for at least three years preceding his election; and be a voter of the district for which he was elected. Further, the individual must have completed at least the eighth grade in the common schools; must not have held or discharged the duties of any civil or political office, deputyship or agency under the city or county of his residence; must not have been directly or indirectly interested in the sale to the board of books, stationery, or any other property, materials, supplies, equipment or services for which school funds were expended; and must never have been removed from membership on a board of education for cause. There was no state requirement in Kentucky making it mandatory for newly elected or appointed board members to attend any kind of training program.

The Kentucky Department of Education did not have a program specifically developed for school board member training. The Department did, however, cooperate in every way possible with the Kentucky School Boards Association in this area. The Kentucky School Boards Association from time to time offered voluntary orientation conferences for new school board members. By means of publications, regional meetings, and state conventions, the Association worked to provide inservice training for all board members.

The Kentucky Department of Education referred this investigator to the Kentucky School Boards Association for suggestions

Table 24

Information Concerning Georgia Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State
Department of Education and State School Boards Association

Qualifications For School Board Member	Existing Preservice Or Inservice Training Programs	Suggestions For School Board Member Training Program
Men of good moral character	Georgia School Boards Association provides board members with informational meetings to inform them of current school problems as well as laws and regulations that might affect their schools	Georgia Department of Education: Methods of developing school policies Permitting administrators to carry out the policies
A fair knowledge of the elementary branches of an English education	Georgia School Boards Association supplements such preservice or in- service training as local board members receive at the local level by sponsor- ing annually special clinics for new board members	Georgia School Boards Association: Understanding relationships between board members and the Superintendent Setting of educational goals for the school program Understanding of the differ- ence between "policy" and "administrative rules"
Favorable to the common school system	Such training programs are made available to elected board members prior to assuming office and fol- lowing their assumption of official duties	Knowledge and understanding of decision-making process Understanding relationships between board members and community Understanding relationships between board members and the staff Knowledge and understanding of fiscal and budgetary affairs
No requirement for pro- spective or new board members to participate in any type of training program before or after being elected to their positions		

Table 24 (Continued)

Qualifications For School Board Member	Existing Preservice Or Inservice Training Programs	Suggestions For School Board Member Training Program
	<p>Appreciably good attendance is experienced at these clinics</p> <p>In addition to these clinics, the Georgia School Boards Association sponsors follow-up meetings and informational releases in an attempt to assist school board members in becoming well-rounded and generally effective board members</p>	<p>Awareness of appropriate channels and lines of communication or authority in school board matters</p> <p>Knowledge of legislation related to public school education</p>

pertaining to topics needed for a school board member training program. The Association felt that any such training program should include basic elements of school law, school finance, functions and responsibilities of the management team, and relevant information of a specific and current nature. The above information concerning the Kentucky Department of Education and the Kentucky School Boards Association can be found in Table 25.

Qualifications for school board membership in the state of Mississippi were very simple. The only legal qualification specified was that board members be qualified voters. There was no mention of any requirement stating that board members must undergo any type of training either before or after election or appointment.

The Mississippi Department of Education had no organized program for the purpose of orienting and training school board members. The Mississippi School Boards Association sponsored conferences and workshops from time to time for new school board members. The stated objective of these meetings was to prepare new board members for their jobs. The Association also made available a number of publications which helped to orient and train the new school board member.

The Mississippi Department of Education made the following recommendations for factors to include in a training program for school board members: school law; school finance; interest groups; buildings and equipment; public relations; board policies; and curriculum and instruction. The suggestions for a board member training program offered by the Mississippi School Boards Association were as follows: the budget; board functions; accountability; management skills and techniques; powers and duties of the school board; communication;

Table 25

Information Concerning Kentucky Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State
Department of Education and State School Boards Association

Qualifications For School Board Member	Existing Preservice Or Inservice Training Programs	Suggestions For School Board Member Training Program
At least twenty-four years old	Kentucky School Boards Association from time to time offers voluntary orientation conferences for new school board members	Kentucky Department of Education: Referred investigator to Kentucky School Boards Association
A citizen of Kentucky for at least three years preceding election		
A voter of district for which elected	By means of publications, regional meetings, and state conventions, the Kentucky School Boards Association works to provide inservice train- ing for all board members	Kentucky School Boards Association: School law School finance Functions and responsibilities of the management team Relevant information of a specific and current nature
Completed at least the eighth grade in the common schools		
Not hold or discharge the duties of any child or political office, deputy- ship or agency under the city or county of residence		
Not be directly or indirectly interested in the sale to the board of books, station- ery, or any other property, materials, supplies, equip- ment or service for which school funds are expended		

Table 25 (Continued)

Qualifications For School Board Member	Existing Preservice Or Inservice Training Programs	Suggestions For School Board Member Training Program
<p>Never had been removed from membership on a board of education for cause</p> <p>No requirement making it mandatory for newly elected or appointed board members to attend any kind of training program</p>	<p>Missouri State Department of Education stated that the Missouri School Boards Association conducted workshops on a regular basis to educate school board members on current educational problems. The Missouri School Boards Association reported that it did have an organized orientation program for school board members. The program was a series of workshops for board members offered throughout the year. Sessions were placed on a yearly basis and included topics of interest to today's school board member. The Missouri State Department of Education suggested the following topics for school board member training programs: school finance; public school relations; and board relations. The Missouri School Boards Association felt the following topics would be helpful in improvement of school board performance: school finance; public school relations; and board relations.</p>	<p>no law dealing with personnel problems; financial problems; facilities; and other legal aspects. The above data and information concerning Missouri can be found in Table 20.</p> <p>Revised Statutes of Missouri provided that board members of the United States and resident taxpayers of the district must have resided in the state for at least one year immediately prior to their election. Lastly, a person must be at least thirty years of age to be eligible for board membership. There were no laws requiring that a board member was required to take part in any training program either before or after election or</p>

policy making; personnel problems; financial problems; facilities; and the tenure law and other legal aspects. The above data and information concerning Mississippi can be found in Table 26.

The Revised Statutes of Missouri provided that board members be citizens of the United States and resident taxpayers of the district. They must have resided in the state for at least one year immediately preceding their election. Lastly, a person must be at least thirty years of age to be eligible for board membership. There were no qualifications stating that a board member was required to take part in any kind of training program either before or after election or appointment.

Although maintaining no such program itself, the Missouri Department of Education stated that the Missouri School Boards Association sponsored workshops on a regular basis to educate school board members on current educational problems. The Missouri School Boards Association concurred that it did have an organized orientation or training program for school board members. The program was in the form of regular workshops for board members offered throughout the state. These workshops were planned on a yearly basis and included all relevant topics of concern to today's school board member.

The Missouri Department of Education suggested the following topics for emphasis in a school board member training program: curriculum and instruction; school law; school finance; public relations; facilities; board-superintendent relations; and board policy. The Missouri School Boards Association felt the following traits were important for the improvement of school board performance and should be included in any training program for school board members:

Table 26

Information Concerning Mississippi Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State Department of Education and State School Boards Association

Qualifications For School Board Member	Existing Preservice Or Inservice Training Programs	Suggestions For School Board Member Training Program
<p>Qualified voters</p> <p>No requirement stating that board members must undergo some type of training either before or after election or appointment</p>	<p>Mississippi School Boards Association sponsors conferences and workshops from time to time for new school board members</p> <p>Objective of these meetings is to prepare new board members for their jobs</p> <p>Mississippi School Boards Association makes available a number of publications which help to orient and train the new school board member</p>	<p>Mississippi Department of Education:</p> <p>School law</p> <p>School finance</p> <p>Interest groups</p> <p>Buildings and equipment</p> <p>Public relations</p> <p>Board policies</p> <p>Curriculum and instruction</p> <p>Mississippi School Boards Association:</p> <p>The budget</p> <p>Board functions</p> <p>Accountability</p> <p>Management skills and techniques</p> <p>Powers and duties of the school board</p> <p>Communication</p> <p>Policy making</p> <p>Personal problems</p> <p>Financial problems</p> <p>Facilities</p> <p>The tenure law and other legal aspects</p>

school board-administrator relations; probable consequence of certain school board behaviors; due process for teachers' and students' grievance procedures; what the board member needs to know about school finance; school board problem solving; public relations for school board members; and the board's responsibilities for evaluation of staff performance. Further suggestions included: ethics and responsibilities for school board members; legal developments in school finance; legal aspects of teacher-school board relations; legal aspects of pupil-school board relations; and importance of school board policies and definitions. The Association also recommended: procedures in policy development; national and state laws, court decisions and state regulations as they affect school board policies; school boards' and administrators' roles in policy development and implementation; and subject matter and codification of school policies. Also to be included were: evaluation and revision of school policies; dynamics of professional negotiations; legislation for negotiations for school boards and teachers; negotiations from the employee's point of view; and the cost of negotiations. The above information obtained as a result of the letter of inquiry from the Missouri Department of Education and the Missouri School Boards Association is capsuled in Table 27.

The North Carolina Department of Education referred all questions in the area of school board member orientation and training to the North Carolina School Boards Association. The Department of Education had very little involvement in this area. Qualifications for school board membership in North Carolina included intelligence, good moral character, good business qualifications, and being in favor

Table 27

Information Concerning Missouri Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State
Department of Education and State School Boards Association

Qualifications For School Board Member	Existing Preservice Or Inservice Training Programs	Suggestions For School Board Member Training Program
<p>Citizens of the United States</p> <p>Resident taxpayers of the district</p> <p>Resided in the state for at least one year immediately preceding election</p> <p>At least thirty years of age</p> <p>No qualifications stating that a board member is required to take part in any kind of training program either before or after election or appointment</p>	<p>Missouri School Boards Association has an organized orientation or training program for school board members</p> <p>The program is in the form of regular workshops for board members offered throughout the state</p> <p>Their purpose is to educate school board members on current educational problems</p> <p>These workshops are planned on a yearly basis and include all relevant topics of concern to today's school board member</p>	<p>Missouri Department of Education: Curriculum and instruction School law School finance Public relations Facilities Board-superintendent relations Board policy</p> <p>Missouri School Boards Association: School board-administrator relations Probable consequences of certain school board behaviors Due process for teachers and students Grievance procedures What the board member needs to know about school finance School board problem solving Public relations for school board members The board's responsibilities for evaluation of staff performance</p>

Table 27 (Continued)

Qualifications For School Board Member	Existing Preservice Or Inservice Training Programs	Suggestions For School Board Member Training Program
		<p>Ethics for school board members</p> <p>Responsibilities of school board members</p> <p>Legal developments in school finance</p> <p>Legal aspects of teacher-school board relations</p> <p>Legal aspects of pupil-school board relations</p> <p>Importance of school board policies and definitions</p> <p>Procedures in policy development</p> <p>National and state laws, court decisions and state regulations as they affect school board policies</p> <p>School boards' and administrators' roles in policy development and implementation</p> <p>Subject matter and codification of school policies</p> <p>Evaluation and revision of school policies</p> <p>Dynamics of professional negotiations</p>

Table 27 (Continued)

Qualifications For School Board Member	Existing Preservice Or Inservice Training Programs	Suggestions For School Board Member Training Program
		Legislation for negotiations for school boards and teachers Negotiations from the employee's point of view The cost of negotiations

of public education. No person actually engaged in teaching in the public schools, or serving as an employee of the schools, or engaged in teaching in or conducting a private school which might have affiliations with a public school, and no member of a district committee, was eligible to serve as a member of a county or city board of education. A member of a board of education was declared to be an officer who could hold concurrently any appointive office, but any person holding an elective office was not eligible to serve as a member of a county or city board of education. There was no mention of requiring new or prospective school board members to participate in any type of preservice or inservice training program.

Though the state did not require new board members to participate in any type of training program, annual new board members orientation seminars were offered by the North Carolina School Boards Association. These seminars were conducted at four locations across the state during December, in cooperation with branches of the University of North Carolina. Newly elected board members were usually urged by local administrators and fellow board members to attend, but none were required to attend.

As for items to be included in a training program for school board members, the following factors were recommended by the North Carolina School Boards Association: school board-superintendent relationships; legal and ethical responsibilities of school boards; services of the state school boards associations; school law and policies; the board's role in curriculum and instruction; and regional and state educational services available to local school systems. The Association made every attempt to keep topics of discussion current,

so they often changed from year to year. Of course, there were the basics which were always covered. The above data dealing with the North Carolina Department of Education and the North Carolina School Boards Association is summarized in Table 28.

At the time, the only qualification for school board membership in Virginia was that one must be a resident of the locality in which one served. All board members were appointed, and no orientation or inservice requirements existed.

The Virginia Department of Education had no involvement in the orientation or training of school board members. The Department directed this investigator to contact the Virginia School Boards Association for any information regarding this matter. The Virginia School Boards Association considered the orientation of school board members to be one of the major activities of the organization. The Association had several publications it used for this purpose in addition to individual board workshops and orientation sessions.

As for suggestions for a board member training program, the Virginia Department of Education again referred all inquiries to the Virginia School Boards Association. At the time of this study, the Virginia School Boards Association was in the process of compiling a set of updated orientation materials. At the completion of this study, the materials had not yet become available. The following topics were suggested by the Association as being important for a school board member training program: school board policy guide; school boards associations; legal responsibilities; facilities; transportation; controversial issues; school finance; and school law. The above information concerning Virginia is summarized in Table 29.

Table 28

Information Concerning North Carolina Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State
Department of Education and State School Boards Association

Qualifications For School Board Member	Existing Preservice Or Inservice Training Programs	Suggestions For School Board Member Training Program
Intelligence	North Carolina School Boards Association	North Carolina Department of Education:
Good moral character	offers annual new board member orientation seminars	Referred investigator to North Carolina School Boards Association
Good business qualifications		
Being in favor of public education	These seminars are conducted at four locations across the state during December in cooperation with branches of the University of North Carolina	North Carolina School Boards Association: School board-superintendent relationship Legal and ethical respon- sibilities of school boards Services of the state school boards associations School law and policies The board's role in curriculum and instruction Regional and state educational services available to local school systems
No person while actually engaged in teaching in the public schools or serving as an employee of the schools or engaged in teaching in or conducting a private school in con- nection with which private school there is in any manner conducted a public school and no member of a district committee shall be eligible as a member of a county or city board of education	Newly elected board members are usually urged to attend by local administrators and fellow board members	

Table 28 (Continued)

Qualifications For School Board Member	Existing Preservice Or Inservice Training Programs	Suggestions For School Board Member Training Program
<p>A member of a board of education is declared to be an officer that may hold concurrently any appointive office, but any person holding an elective office is not eligible to serve as a member of a county or city board of education</p>	<p>Preservice training program for school board members</p>	<p>Preservice training program for school board members</p>
<p>No mention of requiring new or prospective school board members to participate in any type of preservice or inservice training program</p>	<p>Inservice training program for school board members</p>	<p>Inservice training program for school board members</p>

Table 29

Information Concerning Virginia Obtained Through Letter of Inquiry to State
Department of Education and State School Boards Association

Qualifications For School Board Member	Existing Preservice Or Inservice Training Programs	Suggestions For School Board Member Training Program
A resident of the locality in which one serves	Virginia School Boards Association considers the orientation of school board members to be one of the major activities of the organization	Virginia Department of Education: Referred investigator to Virginia School Boards Association
All board members are appointed and no orien- tation requirements exist	Virginia School Boards Association has several publications it uses for this purpose in addition to individual board workshops and orien- tation sessions	Virginia School Boards Association: School board policy guide School Boards Associations Legal responsibilities Facilities Transportation Controversial issues School finance School law

QUESTIONS TESTED FOR THE STUDY

Question Number One

The first question asked: What are Tennessee's present qualifications for serving as a school board member?

Tennessee law required that a school board member be a resident and voter of the county, city, or district in which he was elected, be a citizen of recognized integrity and intelligence, and have the ability to fulfill the duties of his office. He was required to have a "practical education" and removal from the county, city, or special school district automatically relieved him of his office as a board member. A county board member could not be a member of the county court or hold any other county office which paid a salary. Tennessee's qualifications for serving as a school board member, as well as the qualifications for serving as a board member in Tennessee's eight border states (Question Number One), are summarized in Table 30.

Question Number Two

The second question asked: Does Tennessee have any type of preservice or inservice training for school board members?

Based upon the findings of this study, it was concluded that the state of Tennessee had no formal organized program of preservice or inservice training for school board members. However, the Tennessee School Boards Association did sponsor some seminars, conferences, and the like for school board members, and the Association's annual convention included a number of orientation and training opportunities for board members. On certain occasions, various school systems initiated their own orientation or training sessions. From time to

Table 30

Qualifications For Serving As a Board Member in Tennessee and in
Tennessee's Eight Border States

State	Qualifications
Alabama	<p>Good character</p> <p>Adequate elementary education</p>
Arkansas	<p>A bona fide resident of the district in which one wishes to serve</p> <p>A qualified elector of the district</p> <p>A third requirement, that of ownership of property in the district, has been declared invalid by the Federal District Court</p>
Georgia	<p>Men of good moral character</p> <p>A fair knowledge of the elementary branches of an English education</p> <p>Favorable to the common school system</p> <p>At least twenty-four years old</p> <p>A citizen of Kentucky for at least three years preceding election</p>
Kentucky	

Table 30 (Continued)

State	Qualifications
Mississippi	<p>A voter of district for which elected</p> <p>Completed at least the eighth grade in the common schools</p> <p>Not hold or discharge the duties of any civil or political office, deputyship or agency under the city or county of residence</p> <p>Not be directly or indirectly interested in the sale of the board of books, stationery, or any other property, materials, supplies, equipment or services for which school funds are expended</p> <p>Never have been removed from membership on a board of education for cause</p>
Missouri	<p>Qualified voters</p> <p>Citizens of the United States</p> <p>Resident tax payers of the district</p> <p>Resided in the state for at least one year immediately preceding election</p> <p>At least thirty years of age</p>

Table 30 (Continued)

State	Qualifications
North Carolina	<p>Intelligence</p> <p>Good moral character</p> <p>Good business qualifications</p> <p>Being in favor of public education</p> <p>No person while actually engaged in teaching in the public schools, or serving as an employee of the schools, or engaged in teaching in or conducting a private school in connection with which private school there is in any manner conducted a public school, and no member of a district committee, shall be eligible as a member of a county or city board of education</p> <p>A member of a board of education is declared to be an officer that may hold concurrently any appointive office, but any person holding an elective office is not eligible to serve as a member of a county or city board of education</p>
Tennessee	<p>A resident and voter of the county, city, or district in which elected</p> <p>A citizen of recognized integrity and intelligence</p>

Table 30 (Continued)

State	Qualifications
Virginia	<p data-bbox="406 564 429 1152">Ability to fulfill the duties of office</p> <p data-bbox="467 838 489 1152">"Practical education"</p> <p data-bbox="527 348 588 1152">Removal from county, city, or special school district automatically relieves one of office as board member</p> <p data-bbox="625 348 709 1152">County board member may not be a member of the county court or hold any other county office which pays a salary</p> <p data-bbox="742 458 765 1152">A resident of the locality in which one serves</p>

time, several systems got together and cooperated on such a venture. Max Harrison, a member of the Tennessee Department of Education, informed this investigator that the Department was concerned about the lack of adequate training for school board members in the state of Tennessee. Harrison added that the Tennessee Department of Education was interested in initiating some kind of training program for the board members of the state. The above information concerning the existence, or lack of it, of preservice or inservice training programs in Tennessee and in Tennessee's eight border states (Question Number Four) is summarized in Table 31.

Question Number Three

The third question asked: What are the qualifications for serving as a school board member in Tennessee's bordering states?

Tennessee's eight border states are: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, and Virginia. Alabama state code stipulated that members of county and city boards of education had to be persons of good character, who possessed an adequate elementary education. These were the only legal qualifications.

To qualify for school board membership in the state of Arkansas, a person had to be a bona fide resident of the district in which he or she wished to serve and a qualified elector of the district. A third requirement, that of ownership of property in the district, had been declared invalid by the Federal District Court.

The Constitution of the state of Georgia related these qualifications for membership on local boards of education: "They shall elect men of good moral character, who shall have at least a fair

Table 31

Preservice or Inservice Training Programs in Tennessee
and in Tennessee's Eight Border States

State	Training Programs
Alabama	<p>Alabama School Boards Association conducts meetings in such a way as to be of a workshop type where the participants can learn much about the proper functioning of local boards of education.</p> <p>Alabama School Boards Association normally conducts a statewide orientation program for new school board members.</p> <p>Locally school boards typically handle through their administrative staffs, a program of orientation for newly elected or appointed school board members.</p>
Arkansas	<p>Arkansas School Boards Association feels it the responsibility of the local superintendent and the experienced board members to formulate and carry out a program of orientation that will help a new board member to become acquainted with his role and his duties.</p> <p>To assist each school system in this undertaking, the Arkansas School Boards Association publishes a handbook for Arkansas school board members entitled <u>Effective School Board Membership</u>.</p>

Table 31 (Continued)

State	Training Programs
Georgia	<p>Georgia School Boards Association provides board members with informational meetings to inform them of current school problems as well as laws and regulations that might affect their schools</p> <p>Georgia School Boards Association supplements such preservice or inservice training as local board members receive at the local level by sponsoring annually special clinics for new board members</p> <p>Such training programs are made available to elected board members prior to assuming office and following their assumption of official duties</p> <p>Appreciably good attendance is experienced at these clinics</p> <p>In addition to these clinics, the Georgia School Boards Association sponsors follow-up meetings and informational releases in an attempt to assist school board members in becoming well-rounded and generally effective board members</p>
Kentucky	<p>Kentucky School Boards Association from time to time offers voluntary orientation conferences for new school board members</p> <p>By means of publications, regional meetings, and state conventions, the Kentucky School Boards Association works</p>

Table 31 (Continued)

State	Training Programs
Mississippi	<p data-bbox="405 368 434 1154">to provide inservice training for all board members</p> <p data-bbox="464 280 553 1154">Mississippi School Boards Association sponsors conferences and workshops from time to time for new school board members</p> <p data-bbox="583 260 642 1154">Objective of these meetings is to prepare new board members for their jobs</p> <p data-bbox="672 280 761 1154">Mississippi School Boards Association makes available a number of publications which help to orient and train the new school board member</p>
Missouri	<p data-bbox="790 280 850 1154">Missouri School Boards Association has an organized orientation or training program for school board members</p> <p data-bbox="880 280 939 1154">The program is in the form of regular workshops for board members offered throughout the state</p> <p data-bbox="969 260 1028 1154">Their purpose is to educate school board members on current educational problems</p> <p data-bbox="1058 280 1147 1154">These workshops are planned on a yearly basis and include all relevant topics of concern to today's school board member</p>

Table 31 (Continued)

State	Training Programs
North Carolina	<p>North Carolina School Boards Association offers annual new board member orientation seminars</p> <p>These seminars are conducted at four locations across the state during December in cooperation with branches of the University of North Carolina</p> <p>Newly elected board members are usually urged to attend by local administrators and fellow board members</p> <p>Program of preservice or inservice training for school board members in the state</p>
Tennessee	<p>Tennessee School Boards Association sponsors some seminars, conferences, and the like for school board members</p> <p>Tennessee School Boards Association's annual convention includes a number of orientation and training opportunities for board members</p> <p>From time to time, various school systems initiate their own orientation or training sessions and sometimes more than one system will cooperate on such a venture</p>
Virginia	<p>Virginia School Boards Association considers the orientation of school board members to be one of the major activities of the organization</p>

Table 31 (Continued)

State	Training Programs
	<p>Virginia School Boards Association has several publications it uses for this purpose in addition to individual board workshops and orientation sessions</p>

knowledge of the elementary branches of an English education and be favorable to the common school system."

The qualifications for becoming a school board member in Kentucky were that a person be at least twenty-four years old; have been a citizen of Kentucky for at least three years preceding his election; and be a voter of the district for which he was elected. In addition, individuals must have completed at least the eighth grade in the common schools; and must not have held or discharged the duties of any civil or political office, deputyship or agency under the city or county of his residence. Other requirements stated that individuals: must not have been directly or indirectly interested in the sale to the board of books, stationery, or any other property, materials, supplies, equipment or services for which school funds were expended; and must never have been removed from membership on a board of education for cause.

Qualifications for school board membership in the state of Mississippi were very simple. The only legal qualification specified was that board members be qualified voters.

The Revised Statutes of Missouri provided that board members be citizens of the United States and resident taxpayers of the district. They must have resided in the state for at least one year immediately preceding their election. Lastly, a person must be at least thirty years of age to be eligible for board membership.

Qualifications for school board membership in North Carolina included intelligence, good moral character, good business qualifications, and being in favor of public education. No person actually engaged in teaching in the public schools, or serving as an employee of the schools, or engaged in teaching in or conducting a private

school which might have affiliations with a public school, and no member of a district committee, was eligible to serve as a member of a county or city board of education. A member of a board of education was declared to be an officer who could hold concurrently any appointive office, but any person holding an elective office was not eligible to serve as a member of a county or city board of education.

At the time, the only qualification for school board membership in the state of Virginia was that one must be a resident of the locality in which one served.

The above information dealing with the qualifications for serving as a school board member in Tennessee's eight border states can be seen clearly in Table 30 along with the same data about the state of Tennessee itself (Question Number One).

Question Number Four

The fourth question asked: Do any of these border states have preservice or inservice training programs for school board members?

Tennessee's border states in the order by which they were considered in this section are as follows: Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, and Virginia.

The Alabama Department of Education reported that although it had no orientation or training program for school board members, the state did have a strong association of school boards and their meetings were conducted in such a way as to be of a workshop type where the participants could learn much about the proper functioning of local boards of education. The Alabama Association of School Boards stated that it normally conducted a statewide orientation program for new school board members. In addition, local school boards typically

handled, through their administrative staffs, a program of orientation for newly elected or appointed school board members.

The Arkansas Department of Education itself did not have any type of orientation or training program for school board members, but it did cooperate in every way it could with the Arkansas School Boards Association. The Arkansas School Boards Association felt that a new school board member would take upon himself the responsibility of becoming informed on all aspects of the task he had undertaken. The Association felt, however, that this orientation of new members should not be left entirely to chance. Most new members found themselves confronted with new and unfamiliar facts and conditions, and needed the help that only experienced persons could provide. The phrase "learning on the job" accurately described the situation of most new school board members. Experience alone, however, could be a very slow teacher. An organized orientation program would shorten the time needed by new board members to become functioning members of the school board team. Therefore, the Arkansas School Boards Association felt that it was the responsibility of the local superintendent and the experienced board members to formulate and carry out a program of orientation that would help a new board member to become acquainted with his role and his duties. To assist each school system in this undertaking, the Association published a handbook for Arkansas school board members entitled Effective School Board Membership. One section of the book dealt specifically with the orientation and continuing education of school board members.

The Georgia Department of Education stated that the Georgia School Boards Association provided board members with informational

meetings to inform them of current school problems as well as laws and regulations that might affect their schools. The Georgia School Boards Association reported that it supplemented such preservice or inservice training as local board members received at the local level by sponsoring annually special clinics for new board members. Such training programs were made available to elected board members prior to assuming office and following their assumption of official duties. Appreciably good attendance was experienced at these clinics.

The Kentucky Department of Education did not have a program specifically developed for school board member training. The Department did, however, cooperate in every way possible with the Kentucky School Boards Association in this area. The Kentucky School Boards Association from time to time offered voluntary orientation conferences for new school board members. By means of publications, regional meetings, and state conventions, the Association worked to provide inservice training for all board members.

The Mississippi Department of Education had no organized program for the purpose of orienting and training school board members. The Mississippi School Boards Association sponsored conferences and workshops from time to time for new school board members. The stated objective of these meetings was to prepare new board members for their jobs. The Association also made available a number of publications which helped to orient and train the new school board member.

Although maintaining no such program itself, the Missouri Department of Education stated that the Missouri School Boards Association sponsored workshops on a regular basis to educate school

board members on current educational problems. The Missouri School Boards Association concurred that they did have an organized orientation or training program for school board members. The program was in the form of regular workshops for board members offered throughout the state. These workshops were planned on a yearly basis and included all relevant topics of concern to today's school board member.

The North Carolina Department of Education had very little involvement in the orientation and training of school board members. Though the state did not require new board members to participate in any type of training program, annual new board member orientation seminars were offered by the North Carolina School Boards Association. These seminars were conducted at four locations across the state during December, in cooperation with branches of the University of North Carolina. Newly elected board members were usually urged by local administrators and fellow board members to attend, but none were required to attend.

The Virginia Department of Education had no involvement in the orientation or training of school board members. The Virginia School Boards Association considered the orientation of school board members to be one of the major activities of the organization. The Association had several publications it used for this purpose in addition to individual board workshops and orientation sessions.

The above information relating to the absence or presence of preservice or inservice training programs in Tennessee's eight border states is summarized in Table 31 along with similar data about the state of Tennessee itself.

Question Number Five

The fifth question asked: What type of activities should a prospective school board member be familiar with before he assumes his job?

The answer to the fifth question was one of the major objectives of this study. Therefore, a great deal of time and effort was involved in collecting information on the characteristics that a prospective school board member should be familiar with before he assumes his job. The major sources of information providing answers to this question were the manual and computer searches of the literature, the letters sent to the various state school boards associations and state departments of education, and the survey of the 146 school systems in Tennessee.

Since the data collected from the searches of the literature and the survey of Tennessee's school systems were so similar, it was decided to combine this information. Table 32 summarizes the information from these two sources.

Through the letter of inquiry the state departments of education and the state school boards associations in Tennessee and in Tennessee's eight border states were asked to suggest traits that they felt should be included in a training program for school board members. Logically, these were the types of factors they felt a prospective school board member should be familiar with before he assumed his job. Table 33 summarizes this information collected from the state departments of education and Table 34 summarizes the equivalent information obtained from the state school boards associations. Collectively, the above data represents a wealth of

Table 32

Activities a Prospective Board Member Should Be Familiar With Based
on the Searches of the Literature and the Survey of
Tennessee's School Systems

Modern trends and practices in education	Financial progress of the school system
Aims, objectives, outcomes, and techniques of education	School boards associations
Keeping of the minutes of the board meetings	Schools in the school system
Policies book of the school board	Facilities and practices in other systems
By-laws of the school board	Periodicals and books pertaining to the board's work and to educational practices
Annual reports, monthly reports, special reports, weekly bulletins, and staff bulletins from the administrative offices	Public relations
School system's program of supervision	Ideals of education in a democracy
Standards, bidding procedures, purchasing, and storage and distribution of materials and equipment	Evaluation
School lunch program	Evolution of the school board
Pupil transportation	Basic organization of the board of education
	Functions of the board of education
	Planning
	Policy making

Table 32 (Continued)

Legislation	Board member as a state official
Operation of the board of education	Basic information concerning education
Rules and regulations	Rights of school personnel and students
Board meetings	School-community relationships
Board records	Criticism of the school board
Powers and duties of the board of education	The school board and curriculum and instruction
State requirements concerning education	School finance
School law	School facilities
Current status of the board of education	School plant development
Frustrations, pressures, and problems of being a board member	School maintenance
Needs of the individual board member	Communications role of the board of education
Management skills and techniques	School board-superintendent relations
Accountability	School board-staff relations
Controversial issues and how to handle them	Interest groups
	News media

Table 32 (Continued)

Setting goals and evaluating the school program	
Resolution of conflict	
Needs and inclinations of society as a whole	
Improvement of school board service	
New directions for the school board	

Table 33

Factors State Departments of Education Felt Prospective School Board Members
Should Be Familiar With Before Assuming Job

State	Areas of Importance
Alabama	Referred investigator to Alabama School Boards Association
Arkansas	Referred investigator to Arkansas School Boards Association
Georgia	Methods of developing school policies
	Permitting administrators to carry out the policies
Kentucky	Referred investigator to Kentucky School Boards Association
Mississippi	School law
	School finance
	Interest groups
	Buildings and equipment
	Public relations
	Board policies
	Curriculum and instruction

Table 33 (Continued)

State	Areas of Importance
Missouri	Curriculum and instruction School law School finance Public relations Facilities Board-superintendent relations Board policy
North Carolina	Referred investigator to North Carolina School Boards Association
Tennessee	The board member as a state official School finance Curriculum and instruction School law School board-superintendent relations School board-staff relations

Table 33 (Continued)

State	Areas of Importance
Virginia	Public relations Referred investigator to Virginia School Boards Association

Table 34

Factors State School Boards Associations Felt Prospective School Board Members
Should Be Familiar With Before Assuming Job

State	Areas of Importance
Alabama	<p>The board member as a state official</p> <p>The board as a state agency</p> <p>The board as a policy-making body</p> <p>The budget</p> <p>School finance</p> <p>Major board problems</p> <p>Board-staff relations</p> <p>Board-community relations</p> <p>Board-press relations</p> <p>School board problem solving</p> <p>Public school organization</p> <p>Legal aspects of school board membership</p>
Arkansas	

Table 34 (Continued)

State	Areas of Importance
Duties and responsibilities of school boards	
The school budget	
Selecting a superintendent of schools	
Providing an effective educational program	
Providing the necessary personnel	
Providing adequate physical facilities	
Developing and adopting board policy	
The school board and the superintendent	
The school board and the staff	
The school board and the students	
The school board and the community	
Utilizing the news media	
The school board meeting	
Records of meetings	

Table 34 (Continued)

State	Areas of Importance
Georgia	Understanding relationships between board members and the superintendent
	Setting of educational goals for the school program
	Understanding of the difference between "policy" and "administrative rules"
	Knowledge and understanding of decision-making processes
	Understanding relationships between board members and community
	Understanding relationships between board members and the staff
Kentucky	Knowledge and understanding of fiscal and budgetary affairs
	* Awareness of appropriate channels and lines of communication or authority, in school board matters
	Knowledge of legislation related to public school education
	School law
	School finance

Table 34 (Continued)

State	Areas of Importance
Mississippi	Functions and responsibilities of the management team
	Relevant information of a specific and current nature
	The budget
	Board functions
	Accountability
	Management skills and techniques
	Powers and duties of the school board
	Communication
	Policy making
	Personnel problems
Missouri	Financial problems
	Facilities
	The tenure law and other legal aspects
	School board-administrator relations

Table 34 (Continued)

State	Areas of Importance
	Probable consequences of certain school board behaviors
	Due process for teachers and students
	Grievance procedures
	What the board member needs to know about school finance
	School board problem solving
	Public relations for school board members
	The board's responsibilities for evaluation of staff performance
	Ethics for school board members
	Responsibilities of school board members
	Legal developments in school finance
	Legal aspects of teacher-school board relations
	Legal aspects of pupil-school board relations
	Importance of school board policies and definitions

Table 34 (Continued)

State	Areas of Importance
North Carolina	Procedures in policy development
	National and state laws, court decisions and state regulations as they affect school board policies
	School boards' and administrators' roles in policy development and implementation
	Subject matter and codification of school policies
	Evaluation and revision of school policies
	Dynamics of professional negotiations
	Legislation for negotiations for school boards and teachers
	Negotiations from the employee's point of view
	The cost of negotiations
	School board-superintendent relationships
	Legal and ethical responsibilities of school boards
	Services of the state school boards association

Table 34 (Continued)

State	Areas of Importance
Tennessee	School law and policies
	The board's role in curriculum and instruction
	Regional and state educational services available to local school systems
	Duties of board members
	Board policies
	State rules and regulations
	School law
	School finance
	Public relations
	Curriculum and instruction
	Buildings and equipment
Virginia	School board policy guide
	School Boards Associations

Table 34 (Continued)

State	Areas of Importance
	Legal responsibilities
	Facilities
	Transportation
	Controversial issues
	School finance
	School law

information for the answer to the fifth question.

Question Number Six

The sixth question asked: Should some type of preservice program be required of all prospective board members?

Question 13 of the Questionnaire sent to superintendents, board chairmen, and selected board members asked this exact question. Of the 394 persons who completed and returned the Questionnaires, 23.6 percent answered "yes" and 76.4 percent answered "no." Among the 135 superintendents who responded to the question, 35.6 percent answered "yes" and 64.4 percent answered "no." Of the 128 board chairmen who answered the question, 15.6 percent answered "yes" and 84.4 percent answered "no." Among the 131 regular board members who answered the question, 19.1 percent answered "yes" and 80.9 percent answered "no." Based upon the answers to this question, it was quite apparent that the overwhelming majority of the respondents to the Questionnaire were against requiring prospective school board members to participate in some type of preservice orientation program. This information was summarized earlier in the chapter in Table 19.

A closely related piece of information considered the absence or presence of any requirement in Tennessee or Tennessee's border states--Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, and Virginia--stating that prospective or new board members had to participate in some type of training program either before or after being elected or appointed to their positions. The state school boards associations and state departments of education in all the above nine states reported unequivocally that no such requirement existed in their states.

Question Number Seven

The seventh question asked: What would such a preservice and/or inservice program consist of?

The seventh question restated the main problem of the study. Specifically, the problem of the study was to develop a preservice training program for prospective board of education members. The program was also developed so as to be of use by board members already serving. The development of this program was culminated in Chapter 5, and Chapter 5 provides the answer to this seventh, and most important, question.

Question Number Eight

The eighth question asked: How effective is the preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members when tested under actual working conditions?

At this point in the study, the eighth question could not be answered because the preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members had not been developed. Therefore, it was decided by this investigator to report the results of the field testing situation in Chapter 5. This decision seemed to follow a more logical sequence as the school board training program itself was not presented until Chapter 5. The eighth question was answered on the completion of the training program for school board members, and the results of that testing situation are presented in the latter part of Chapter 5.

Chapter 5

A RECOMMENDED TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS:

PRESERVICE AND/OR INSERVICE

The problem of this study focused upon the development of a preservice training program for prospective board of education members. The program was also developed to be of use by board members currently serving. The purpose of Chapter 5 is to present this training program, the seventh question stated in Chapter 1, the results of the investigation as they relate to this question, and the results of the field testing situation. The seventh question asked: What would such a preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members consist of?

The training program for school board members was based upon information collected from manual and computer searches of the literature, from the letter sent to the various state school board associations and state departments of education, and from the survey of the 146 school systems in Tennessee. The findings of the study were presented in Chapter 4.

The major emphasis of the chapter was placed upon the preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members dealt with in the central part of the chapter. A great deal of the information and data collected through the study leaned heavily in the direction of areas of concern by the superintendent for school board members. There was some overlapping, of course, but much of this

information was aimed directly at the superintendent and was not as suitable for a preservice program.

This body of information could have been discarded, but it was felt that this information was too important to be ignored. Therefore, the decision was made to include a section prior to the actual presentation of the preservice and/or inservice training program dealing specifically with primary areas of concern by the superintendent for school board members. The first part of Chapter 5 dealt with this matter.

PRIMARY AREAS OF CONCERN BY THE SUPERINTENDENT

The major task of this study was to develop a preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members. During the course of the study certain activities which did not lend themselves to the above classification but which leaned toward primary areas of concern by the superintendent for school board members were uncovered. The following paragraphs dealt with this information. Again, it must be stressed that there remained considerable overlapping between these activities and those of the preservice and/or inservice training program. Some of the items could easily have been classified in either category. This investigator attempted to assign the items to one of the above two categories according to proper suitability. The reason for attempting this classification was twofold: firstly, all the items were not appropriate for placing them into one category, and secondly, the information was felt to be of too great importance to be discarded altogether.

These primary areas of concern by the superintendent for school board members, like those activities in the preservice and/or inservice training program, were based upon the results of the study. It was felt that the superintendent of schools should be the key individual in a local school system to provide informative activities for school board members. Stated in more definite terms and based on the findings of the study, it is the definite responsibility of the superintendent to proceed with a program of information and enrichment for the school board members in his system. Hopefully, each superintendent will assume his responsibility in this area and move forward with his duties.

One point must be kept in mind. No one program could possibly serve every system. Naturally, there will be many similarities between programs, but such a program must be individualized for the community it is to serve.

In order for a program of this nature to work, cooperation between the superintendent and the board members must be ever present. Appropriate facts must be used to support any action taken by the board. In accordance, board members must be informed of and made familiar with the facts prior to board meetings. This is the duty of the superintendent and is the point at which cooperation appears.

Again, it was felt that the overall responsibility for making provisions in the primary areas of concern for school board members rested with the superintendent of schools. Such a program must be a continuous effort for it is one task which can never really be completed. The following statements concern more definite inservice activities for school board members which can be highly beneficial to any board of education.

One of the simplest, and probably one of the most obvious aids to inservice activity is the keeping of the minutes of the board meetings. It is the responsibility of the board to maintain accurate, legal, and complete minutes of all meetings. The superintendent should be certain that this matter is dealt with and that each board member receives a copy of these minutes. The superintendent may serve as the secretary of the board. However, it is the manner by which the minutes are kept and what happens to them, rather than the keeper, which is important. The superintendent may send each board member a copy of the minutes immediately after each meeting or he may include them as a portion of the regular agenda. It should be stressed that the minutes must be carefully written and should be given to each board member at least three days before the next meeting if at all possible.

Another asset included is the policies book of the school board. This book is a concise record of motions made by the board. These records greatly simplify searches for information concerning board action and replace the chore of reading several volumes of recorded minutes. Board actions regarding any area are kept in chronological order under subject headings. This record should be kept in the superintendent's office or, more desirably, copies should be made available for each board member.

Closely related to the above item, the by-laws of the board of education are of great assistance. Naturally, they must be properly written and continually updated. Each board member should be furnished with a copy of the by-laws and should possess his copy at each board meeting. If the by-laws are allowed to become out-dated, they lose their value. Care must be taken to prevent the by-laws from becoming

too restrictive and, therefore, harmful. By-laws can and will be very helpful provided they are used properly.

Educational bulletins and pamphlets may be provided by the superintendent as additional aids. Among these publications written by the superintendent are annual reports, and weekly bulletins. In addition, staff bulletins are published from the administrative office. Special reports, such as transportation and cafeteria reports, are examples of the materials available for effectively interpreting school management to the board.

The superintendent must remember that any periodic report made to the school board should be written in an accurate, concise and easily understood manner. These reports, containing only important matters that are of interest to board members, should be distributed to the board members adequately ahead of the meeting so that they will be able to study these materials.

The superintendent's annual report is extremely important. It must present the most comprehensive study of the school system possible. This report should be widely distributed, not missing any key lay persons in the system. The superintendent can not possibly prepare the annual report alone. The cooperative effort of the whole school staff is necessary. Greater interest and enthusiasm in the school system and its programs will be the reward if this report is conscientiously planned.

Such a research report can become one of the most valuable activities in which the board is involved. If a school system is interested in increasing its research services, a good way to do so is to help board members better understand the values of good research. This may be best accomplished by the superintendent's supervision of

the compilation of periodic reports dealing with any research within the system and with the distribution of this material. These reports should not sacrifice clarity for technical explanations. Rather, they should be worded interestingly and with non-scientific terminology, thus allowing the average layman to understand and, therefore, appreciate the importance of the research. Research subjects in a school system might involve finance, guidance, textbooks, special student problems, testing programs, analysis of supplies and equipment, the curriculum and a hundred other matters. The importance of such research findings being made available to board members is evident. This material should also include recommendations by which the research may be followed and analyzed.

Special reports to the board concerning the activities of the professional staff should be made by the superintendent. Whenever a member of the staff indicates professional growth through some activity in which he has been engaged, the board should be informed. For example, teachers being elected to various educational offices or possibly staff members writing pamphlets, articles or books are of interest to board members. Keeping the board well-informed concerning such matters is one of the most effective means through which board members can come to understand the lives and problems of staff members.

To insure the board's staying involved in this all important aspect of the school system, the board should be asked to approve all plans for professional growth of the staff, and thus receive regular progress reports. Further, the board can be assisted in understanding its staff if the superintendent makes certain that the board understands the personnel records of every member of the system as well as

approving them. Job descriptions for the various positions in the school system are closely related to personal records. The superintendent should involve the board in adopting job descriptions for each position as well as in evaluating the personnel in terms of these job descriptions.

The school system's program of supervision is another area in which the superintendent must report to the board. He should strive to carefully explain the goals and objectives of the program and the means by which they are to be achieved. This area can not be over emphasized,

After accepting the superintendent's report, the board should consider and approve the standards, bidding procedures, purchasing, and storage and distribution of all materials and equipment. Each board member should have in his possession an official list of textbooks used in the system as well as a list of as many official selections as are desired. The step-by-step process for storage, protection, repair, and distribution should be carefully detailed for board members. Above all, accurate records must be kept and periodically explained to the board.

The school lunch program is an area in which the board must receive and study current information. The board should approve the entire process concerning the handling of the school lunch funds. Included here are the board's approval of the prices to be charged in the lunchroom, the location of purchases, the purchasing of equipment, and the type of school lunch records to be kept. The superintendent and his staff, or their agents, are actually responsible for the operation of the cafeteria itself. A complete monthly report to the board consisting of the receipts, expenditures, meals served, and the

gain or loss is also the responsibility of the administration. These reports must be written and become cumulative reports which picture the entire school lunch program.

Among the concerns of boards of education today is pupil transportation. All matters having to do with the transportation program, such as the purchase of buses, the hiring of drivers, the routes of travel, the rules to be enforced, the housing, the service, and the purchase of insurance, must be approved by the board. The actual administering of the program is left to the administrator. The superintendent should report monthly on each bus in such a way that the board has the complete program clearly in mind. In most states, these reports are required by law. There appears to be no reason preventing the superintendent from being able to make such reports to the board. These reports are invaluable in helping board members to better understand unit costs, the kind of service rendered, the need for an extension of service or a restriction of service, and to face confidently the many questions constantly asked by taxpayers.

Most frequently presented to the board by the superintendent is the financial report. Administering the school system's finances is an important area, but the superintendent must not neglect other important matters which also warrant attention and should be reported to the board members. Every efficient school system should establish a comprehensive financial system. Any part of this system worthy of reporting should be presented to the school board.

Reports to the school board members should cover a variety of areas. A budget study and comparison, reports of receipts, tuition received and outstanding, and all other financial matters of current

interest should be delegated monthly. Tax collections and rates need to be analyzed regularly. Copies of the salary schedules and staff salaries should be in the hands of every board member. An annual audit, required in many cases, is necessary and should be readily available for examination by the entire board. The superintendent should report to the board on a regular basis concerning funds from extra-curricular activities.

It is the responsibility of the superintendent to report to the board on the financial progress of the school system. He should do his best to stay within the limits of the budget and should present written evidence to the board to this effect. When the time for preparation of the annual budget arrives, the superintendent should present the board with various types of budget studies. This will prove to be of valuable assistance to board members.

One of the most important steps a superintendent can take for the board members is the preparation of an agenda sheet for them monthly. He then forwards a copy of this agenda to each board member, making certain that each has ample time to study it before the next board meeting. The minutes of the last meeting, new and old business, bills to be paid, miscellaneous reports, and any other matter intended for the information of the board are the types of items that may be included in the agenda.

Organization is the key word in preparing a successful agenda sheet. It should be organized to the point that each item is clearly discernible and thus, easily studied by the board members. All matters to be considered by the board, insofar as it is possible to forecast, should be included within the agenda sheets.

Each board member should be provided with two copies of the agenda sheet, one forwarded to him ahead of time and the other waiting at his desk when he arrives for the board meeting. In this way each board member can develop a complete file of agendas at home and at the board room. The board member need not go to the trouble of bringing his personal file to every meeting this way. New members will find this complete record of immense value to them as they arrive.

Ranking as one of the better activities for school board members is the scheduling of regular conferences with the superintendent of schools. These conferences should be a venture cooperatively planned by both the superintendent and the board members. These need not be formal meetings, bearing in mind that informal gatherings could be more effective. Further, these conferences could be combined with mutually enjoyable events such as golfing, fishing, or possibly just a friendly get-together.

There are many pitfalls facing a board member, and these conferences between the superintendent and board are one of the best possible ways to avoid many of them. For these meetings to be successful, both sides must be sincerely interested in making them work. The sole aim of these conferences should be the improvement of education in individual school systems.

Most boards of education meet monthly for their regular sessions in order to conduct the general business of the board. Frankly, enough time is not available at these meetings to discuss the serious problems and issues of modern education. In an attempt to remedy this problem, some systems are now scheduling an additional, special board meeting once each month. At these special meetings, the superintendent,

members of his staff, teachers, or even a group of citizens from the community discuss relevant educational problems. Generally, the topic for the evening has been arranged ahead of time.

No individual nor small group of persons can possibly establish sound educational policies and successfully administer them. The purposes of any school system must be constantly evaluated and attempts made to coordinate the school program with these purposes. Board members need a great deal of interpretation in this area. Many contemporary critics declare that board members frequently act hastily and unwisely when considering educational policies. Could such a problem arise because the board members have not been sufficiently informed to enable them to make intelligent decisions?

The use of special board meetings could be a partial answer to this problem. These meetings may be used to explain the reasons behind the system's discontinued adherence to the old line and staff organization and its attempts at trying a more democratic type of organization. These meetings could develop in the board members a desire to visit the schools more often. Board members might make suggestions which are helpful in the development of courses of study, as well as discuss such subjects as curriculum topics and other educational problems. The number of possible topics which can be aired at these special board meetings for educational problems seems almost endless. Any notes or records developing at these meetings should be kept by board members for future reference and use.

Unlimited potential is provided by the board-staff meetings. These meetings should be held several times during each school year.

One of the largest gains resulting from such encounters is the fact that board members and staff members simply become better acquainted with each other. Understood is the fact that these meetings can have a business format providing for the discussion of mutual problems. Virtually any type of occasion is a valid excuse to bring board members and staff members together: teas, dinners, dances, recreational periods, and many other types of activities. Careful planning is a must for these meetings. Honesty and sincerity are necessary ingredients to insure the success of the undertaking. Ulterior motives are beneath the dignity of such groups and must be avoided. Each individual should strive for friendliness and honesty in becoming acquainted with his peers.

Many school board members are affiliated with school boards associations, some of whom are quite active in these organizations on both the state and local level. However, few of these board members attend meetings or conventions at the national level, a problem which often focuses upon finances. This problem may be based upon the fact that either board members lack sufficient funds for such activities or they do not feel justified in spending large amounts of public money for such matters.

Nevertheless, board members should be as active as is feasible in their involvement in professional organizations. Many desirable results can arise from the board members' attending school boards association meetings and conventions. Most state school boards associations are developing programs which can be extremely valuable to local school boards and to their systems. It can not be honestly said that active participation in a school boards association is among

the aids provided by the superintendent for board members. However, it is true that board members who are not encouraged to participate in such activities by their superintendents are not likely to become seriously interested in such associations.

An essential activity for board members is school visitation. Essentially, this is the only means of confronting vis-a-vis the fundamental business of the schools. Superintendents should strongly encourage their board members to visit schools on a regular and frequent basis. They should attend not only those events which are entertaining, such as sporting events and plays, but should also include time spent in classroom observation.

Furthermore, visits to schools by board members will permit them to become better acquainted with the teachers in the school system. The master teacher is the prime factor in an efficient, smoothly functioning school. Hopefully, this fact will become more apparent to board members through school visitation.

Not only should board members visit schools in their own system, but they should also acquaint themselves with the facilities and practices in other systems. This will give them the opportunity for inspection and comparison. The superintendent must become involved in this matter by planning such trips, both in and out of the system, for his board and by constantly emphasizing the importance of such visits.

Many board members would enjoy spending additional time visiting schools, but the fact stands that the majority of people today are so actively involved that they can scarcely find the time to engage in such activities. One possible solution to this problem would involve

the superintendent's providing of films, slides, or still pictures of the system's schools for the board members viewing. This would be a vicarious experience, but it would at least permit involved board members a chance to better understand their system's schools.

Naturally, if they are affordable, films would be the choice in such a matter. However, high quality slides accompanied by narration are excellent forms of explanation and study.

Not only are these films, slides, and pictures adaptable for informing board members, but they can be utilized by board members or staff members as a means of presenting the schools' programs to community groups such as civic clubs and the Chamber of Commerce as a public relations program for the school system. When preparing these visual aids, care should be taken to include photographs of the band, ball teams, and service organizations to add an extra dimension to the coverage of classrooms, the library, the student council in action, and other related materials.

A vital opportunity that should be made available to board members by the superintendent is a professional library. Both periodicals and books pertaining to the board's work and to educational practices should be included. This library need not be compiled hurriedly. Such a library should be developed to provide the best possible selections, building toward a sound collection of educational materials. It is very important that the materials in the library be constantly reviewed and evaluated to insure relevancy and modernity. The library collection should not become cumbersome. Rather, it should be easily accessible to all board members and be made as attractive as possible. Again, it must be remembered that board members

are generally very busy people. The superintendent could assist his board members by having lengthy articles, books, and collections of essays summarized for convenient use by board members.

Maximum advantage of this essential opportunity may be taken by the superintendent suggesting a definite reading program for board members. Two or three sound suggestions for reading materials on various subjects are probably more helpful to the board member than are several pages of a general reading list. Unless an entire book is especially valuable to a board member, it probably would be in the best interest of the board if the superintendent or his staff would suggest certain chapters or portions of chapters to be read. Again, if necessary, articles and books could be summarized for board members.

An effective system for preventing a book or articles from being stranded upon someone's desk is the use of a routing sheet by board members. This sheet contains such pertinent information as the article, the book or periodical to be read, and the names of those persons to whom the items are to be sent. Each individual marks his or her name on the list following his or her reading of the assigned material and then forwards it to the next member.

Board members should not only expect but insist that the superintendent provide them with a suggested reading program and with a professional library. Thus, each individual board member can select those reading materials which interest him or which meet his needs. Reports, bulletins, and studies should be included in the library as should be books and periodicals. Any materials that might assist a board member in answering a question or solving a problem should be considered for inclusion within the professional library for board members.

Very possibly one of the better activities for board members is the short course or mini-course offered by many colleges and universities. The superintendent should strongly encourage his board members to take advantage of these opportunities when they exist. In areas where such studies do not exist, superintendents and board members should work jointly to see that such courses are established. Obviously, colleges will not offer such courses unless an interest is expressed in them.

A less appealing but still potentially valuable experience would be the addition of sessions by colleges and universities for school board members when these educational institutions hold administrative conferences. In either case, the content of such courses would consist of topics of interest to school board members, such as finance, school law, and curriculum studies.

In many school systems, public relations is placed almost entirely under the direction of the superintendent and his administrative staff. This is not the ideal situation for maintaining public relations. The school board is responsible for the schools. It follows, obviously, that much of the responsibility for explaining the organization and working procedures of the public schools should fall upon the shoulders of the school board. By being omitted from this all important phase of school operation, the board member is often placed in the position of being insufficiently informed to answer the questions placed before him. It is true in many cases that the system's administrators are better trained in the area of public relations; however, it is the duty of the superintendent to formulate, in cooperation with the school board, a program of interpretation to the public. Herein

may be discerned another profitable and informative activity for board members.

The school system's public relations program should include a variety of elements, among which is an educational survey of the community undertaken periodically. The survey should be sponsored by the school board and executed by the superintendent. It should be a comprehensive study and should be continually updated. This survey should be a cooperative venture involving the school board, the school staff, and the community. Its purpose should be a determination of the educational needs of those persons within the school system and an interpretation of the needs recorded in concrete educational terms. The school board should be so totally involved in this survey that they will be aware of individually, and as a group, the educational needs of those individuals whom they have been chosen to represent.

Either in conjunction with the educational survey or as a separate project, a population study of the community should be conducted. This study may produce nothing more than a careful analysis of the annual census; however, it may also uncover valuable information concerning the population trends in the community. A number of other factors, such as the areas gaining and losing in population, which can greatly affect school policy can be discovered.

The media--newspapers, radio, television, and such--should be used to their fullest extent to gain various types of school publicity. The superintendent should always be certain that board members are made aware of such publicity. Board members should be informed prior to the time when such publicity is planned, and printed copies of the publicity should be distributed among the board members.

The school board should establish a continuous policy of maintaining close contact with other organizations and groups within the community. Such action can be of significant assistance to both the school board and to the superintendent. Board members are generally civic-minded individuals and many have a sincere interest in all community affairs. As a result, many board members do belong to other community organizations, but some know very little concerning the activities of the community which they serve.

A number of school systems have partially solved this problem by actually assigning board members to various groups and organizations. The board members may go so far as to actually seek membership in these groups, or they may simply investigate the organization and report its activities to the rest of the board. The Chamber of Commerce, the Rotary Club, the Parent Teacher Association, the Lions Club, and other civic organizations whose activities are so vital to the board of education are the types of groups with which board members should become familiar. It is essential that school boards do everything possible to stay well-informed on the activities of such groups.

Hopefully, it will not be necessary for school systems to actually assign its board members to be informed upon the happenings of various organizations. Too often board members can be accused of spying when this happens. A sound relationship between the school board and civic organizations is vital and must be maintained. The development of a cooperative plan, by which school board members and civic group representatives attend each other's meetings interchangeably, should be undertaken if necessary. In most cases, such measures will not be necessary, for most civic groups welcome board

members into their ranks and are happy to do so. Such informal, indirect procedures as these are basically all that is necessary. What is the role of the superintendent in this situation? He must encourage his board members to be active in community affairs and continually emphasize to them the importance of such activities. He may go so far as to assist them in making community contacts when needed.

Evaluation is an important element of the board members' jobs. They must be able to evaluate the educational growth of the schools in their system and to evaluate the community which they serve. Board members rightly expect their superintendent to be familiar with modern educational movements and to know which ones are significant. The board should not place this entire burden upon the superintendent though. They should be able to evaluate such movements to a certain extent.

Many school systems today are anachronisms as far as their educational programs are concerned. In some cases, the superintendent may be at fault. However, numerous other situations reveal that it could be the fault of a poorly informed school board that may be inadequate. It is certainly true that no superintendent can possibly predict all the educational and financial problems that a school system can incur in the future. This does not mean he is excused from doing all that is possible to keep the board members informed concerning future troubles and problems as he can best foresee them.

No matter what school system is considered, the superintendent in that system formulates his own definite ideas and beliefs concerning his relationship with the school board. The previously proposed

activities for school board members will not be acceptable to any superintendent who is not in sympathy with such concepts. The problem of an unethical school board or, possibly, the superintendent's failure to keep the board properly informed can create problems for the school itself. What can be accomplished for the schools is almost limitless if the superintendent will only realize the vast potentialities of school board members as lay contributors to education.

Publicizing the policies of the school board is among the duties of the superintendent. He must keep in mind that not every taxpayer is a parent of a school child nor even a supporter of public education. Every citizen has a right to his own feelings and opinions and also has the right to receive satisfactory answers to his questions concerning school situations. A school system should strive to "sell" itself to the community, to present itself soundly and honorably, in order to achieve a harmonious relationship. Not that it is necessary, or even right, to sell itself, but the schools should be explained and interpreted to the public. Board members should be the very first to receive any information necessary to cope with potential problems, which often can be avoided and hostile taxpayers satisfied, if the superintendent and school board maintain a constructive program of keeping the public informed.

The superintendent was felt to be the key to a successful program of informative activities for school board members. Nevertheless, other organizations such as colleges, school board associations, state departments of education, and administrators' associations should become more active in the area of board problems. Board members must understand their responsibilities to the children, the importance of the master teacher, and the need for curriculum changes. Education

must not make any effort to conceal nor evade anything. The fact is, those individuals--the board members, the staff, and the faculty--who devote so much of their time and energy to the field of education deserve a tremendous amount of credit. A program of mutual understanding can be the basis of a successful school system.

A PRESERVICE AND/OR INSERVICE TRAINING PROGRAM FOR SCHOOL BOARD MEMBERS

The problem of this study was to develop a preservice training program for prospective board of education members and one that could be of use by board members already in service. It was the purpose of this section of Chapter 5 to present this preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members. It was also the purpose of this section of Chapter 5 to provide the answer to the seventh question stated in Chapter 1 which asked: What would a preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members consist of?

1. Where should the training program be held?

The most important consideration here was that the site provided both prospective and veteran school board members with the ultimate opportunity for a sound learning experience. Probably the most common location for board member training programs is the local board room or the central office of the school system. Such a site is adequate; however, the atmosphere of the surroundings can easily cause apprehension and nervousness on the part of school board members, primarily new or prospective ones. Also, holding a training program for school board members in the board room or central office can easily draw criticism and arouse suspicion that the new or prospective

board members are not, in reality, being trained for their jobs but are being indoctrinated into the beliefs and philosophies of both the veteran board members and the school administration. Because of these shortcomings, it is not advisable to hold the training program in such a location.

Another possible site for the school board training program is the same location, and time, in which conventions of the state and national school boards associations are held. This is a sound suggestion, and the school boards associations should certainly make provisions to provide training programs for their members at the annual conventions.

There are, however, two serious limitations to such a location. First, the question must be asked as to how many board members attend these conventions. The answer, of course, is that a very small percentage of the total number of school board members are present. More persons do attend the state school boards association conventions than the national school boards association convention, but the number is still relatively small. It logically follows, then, that if only a small percentage of school board members attend these conventions, then only a small percentage would be exposed to the training programs if such programs were limited to these conventions.

The second limitation of holding school board training programs wherever state and national school board associations hold their conventions is that these conventions are held only once a year and for only a few days at that. As will be explained later in the chapter, this time limit is not satisfactory, for a training program for school board members should be a continuous, ongoing process.

There are numerous other possible locations suitable for the holding of a school board member training program but, based upon the findings of this study, the most satisfactory solution appears to be the locale of a college or university. The major reason lies in that there are enough colleges and universities scattered around any state to provide adequate locations to hold the training programs. Generally, an institution of higher education lies within reasonable driving distance of almost every school board member in a given state. As a result, if training programs were made available for board members on a regional basis at colleges and universities, they would be both convenient and satisfactory for almost every school board member. Additional assets to locating training programs at colleges and universities include: adequate facilities and equipment for holding such programs, ease of finding qualified speakers and workers for the training program, and adequate library facilities. Another advantage of a collegiate location lies in the neutrality that most individuals feel in the atmosphere of a college or university. A relaxed atmosphere for such a program is more readily available at a university or college than is a board room or a superintendent's office. All factors considered, the college or university presents itself as the most versatile and well-rounded location for holding a training program for school board members.

2. By whom should the training program be offered?

The possibilities here are numerous. Such a program could be sponsored by the local superintendent of schools, the local school board, the state department of education, the state school boards association, the National School Boards Association, or any of a number

of other individuals and groups. Probably, the finest choice would be the involvement of all interested individuals and organizations cooperating to provide the school board members with the best possible training for their jobs. The results of this study seemed to indicate that a training program for school board members should be offered by either the local superintendent of schools or by the state school boards association. Both received considerable support from the findings of the study. It was concluded that both the superintendent and the state school boards association should maintain a training program for school board members.

The local superintendent is in an ideal position to provide orientation for new board members concerning their jobs and to provide veteran board members with valuable inservice activities. The superintendent is professionally and physically close to the board members in his system, and he is constantly involved in a working relationship with them. Training these individuals to function successfully should be one of the utmost priorities of the local school superintendent. The largest single criticism of the superintendent sponsoring a training program for the local board members is that he might, either unconsciously or consciously, indoctrinate these board members into his way of thinking. Furthermore, superintendents themselves admit that they do not have sufficient time to complete a thorough program of training their board members.

The other alternative for the carrying out of the board member training program based on the findings of the study would be the state school boards association. Although the superintendent still should do all that is within his abilities to give adequate training

to his own board members, there are a number of reasons that the state school boards association is a more logical choice for conducting school board member training programs. This is especially true when one is speaking of preservice training for prospective school board members. The local superintendent of schools is an extremely active and involved individual who bears the responsibility of running the schools of his system. He can usually manage to be of assistance in the orientation of new board members and to provide inservice for veteran members in his own system. It really is too much to ask to expect him to provide preservice training for every individual who has hopes or aspires to become a school board member. For this reason alone, it is apparent that the state school boards association is a wiser choice for conducting such training sessions.

Another reason for the state school boards association handling such a program is that such an organization has more time, money, and other resources to put into such activities. After all, one of the reasons for the very existence of school boards associations is the assisting of school board members in any way possible. Another reason for electing the state school boards association to conduct school board member training programs is that the association can consolidate its resources. Furthermore, the school boards association is deeply interested in local board members succeeding in their positions. If such training is carried out at the local school system level, it limits the availability of speakers, materials, and other equipment to be used. On the other hand, if the state school boards association conducts the training program on a regional basis in the state and involves a number of school systems, it can take advantage of

consolidated resources. For example, if the services of a leading expert on school board problems were available to a state, it would be totally unreasonable to expect the expert to speak at over a hundred local school boards individually. However, it would not be unreasonable for a state school boards association to invite such an authority to speak to a few regional school board training conferences.

Looking further into the matter, the state school boards association offers the advantage of neutrality. By this it is meant that this organization is not controlled by nor associated with any particular school system, administrator, or administrators' association. State school boards associations were founded to aid school board members. Therefore, it can not be said that this group is biased toward administrators, teachers, or any other groups. Its purpose is to serve its members who are in turn serving the children of the state. If any organization is totally committed to the assisting of school board members and the serving of their interests, it is the state school boards association. For the above reasons and based upon the findings of the study, it was concluded that the best choice for conducting training programs for school board members was the state school boards association.

3. Should lay or professional speakers be used?

The findings of the study overwhelmingly indicated the use of professional speakers. The reasoning behind this selection appeared to be the need for professional and experienced instruction as well as information in such areas as school law, public relations, and curriculum development. Experience would greatly aid in the new board members' understanding of such areas. This was the predominant reason

given by the respondents on the Questionnaire. A number of respondents went on to say that their opposition to lay speakers was based upon a belief that laymen would lean toward personal opinion and biases and too little on fact in presenting their portions of the program. There seemed to be a desire on the part of the respondents to the Questionnaire for exacting and factual information. Obviously, they felt this could best be provided by professional speakers.

4. When should the training program be offered and how long should it last?

When a school board member training program should be offered was the first matter considered. According to the findings of the study, the training program should begin as early as possible. The ideal choice would be to begin study before the time of election or appointment if feasible. The idea here is to begin to prepare each candidate for the school board before he is even considered for the position. It is hoped that if this is accomplished there will be a much better qualified group of board prospects to be considered. Some respondents to the Questionnaire suggested that some sort of certificate be presented to those individuals successfully completing such a pre-service training program for school board members. These persons could then publicize the fact that they had successfully completed such a program and use it in their campaigns for school board member. If all prospective board members completed a sound training program, it would also give the general public greater faith that those individuals selected for the board of education would be able to function and perform as adequately as possible.

Based upon the findings of the study, if the school board

member training program could not be initiated before election or appointment, it then should begin before or immediately after an individual takes office at the very latest. The reasoning here was that the earlier a board member began a training program for his position, the sooner he would be prepared to do his job.

Once it had been established that early training was desirable, the next topic for consideration was the necessary length for such a training program. The findings of the study relating to this area can be expressed through a singular adjective--continuous. There were many varied opinions on this matter of training programs, but the findings established a definite trend in the direction of a continuous training program for school board members, one that would constantly refresh the minds of these individuals concerning major topics of importance for boardmanship as well as keeping them up-to-date on new and modern educational movements and trends. The findings indicated that the best method of achieving this continued instruction would be to offer periodic training sessions of a few hours duration on a regular basis. This concept was based upon the feeling that school board member training is never completed. A board member training program should start as early as is possible and continue for an individual as long as he is a member of the board of education. As was already stated, every board member needs a refresher course periodically, and there is always new and interesting information for board members to learn. In summary, continuous is the word to describe the necessary length of a board member training program.

Closely related to the above matter, the study also attempted to find out whether or not some type of preservice training program

should be required of all prospective school board members. The findings of the study strongly pointed in the direction of not requiring such a training program. At the same time, the findings definitely indicated that such a training program was desirable and should be encouraged of all prospective school board members but not be considered mandatory. It should be offered on a purely voluntary basis.

5. What are the major competency areas that should be included within the structure of the training program?

It would be impossible to provide ready-made solutions for all problems facing board members. It was hoped, however, that by receiving training in certain key areas, school board members would be aided in the development of an inquiring mind. It was also hoped that such training would be of assistance to board members in making the best choices when faced with various alternatives in their jobs. The following paragraphs discuss those areas which should be a part of such a training program for school board members.

From the findings of the study, concentrating upon the Questionnaire sent to superintendents, board chairmen, and selected board members, a multitude of topics for the board member training program arose. This investigator took the enormous number of individual ideas and suggestions for board member training programs and organized them into a few major categories. The next step was to take these major categories and discuss each one. The following paragraphs are the results of that effort. Even though this process was carefully carried out, a certain degree of overlapping between some categories appeared.

The first category considered here concerns the evolution of the school board. Every board member should be familiar with the history and founding philosophies of the concept of a board of education and how such a board evolved into its current position.

The next category or topic to be included within the structure of the board member training program is the basic organization of the board of education. Although the title or position varies in form somewhat from state to state, the officers of the board consist of: the chairman or president, the vice chairman or vice president, the secretary, and the treasurer. The duties of each vary in different states as do the methods by which the officers assume their roles. In addition to its officers, some boards establish standing or permanent committees. Such committees of school boards functioned before the existence of superintendents and other professional administrators. Most experts today agree that school boards probably should not have standing committees. The reason for this being that the duties of most standing committees are executive in nature.

Another important topic to be included in the board member training program covers the functions of the board of education. Although many individuals consider the board to be purely a policy-making body, it does have a limited executive function. In most cases, the executive function is vested in the superintendent and his administrative staff, but in some instances, such as the selection and appointment of the superintendent where it applies, it is a direct executive activity. With the exception of a few such cases, involving the board, the school board is not considered an executive board in the sense that it has immediate operational charge of the school system.

Rather, this responsibility is generally given to the superintendent of schools and his staff. The functions of the school board can be divided into three major areas: planning and policy-making, legislation, and appraisal or evaluation. Board policies are an extremely important matter in themselves and are considered later in the chapter.

Once board members realize how the school board is organized and how it functions, the next major topic for the training program deals with the operation of the board of education. Surprisingly, many board members and some administrators believe the board has power when not in session. These persons feel they have a certain degree of power even when acting as individuals in the community. Nothing could be further from the truth. Not only are they powerless as individuals, but they are just as powerless as a group unless acting within a regular or special, duly called meeting. By powerless it is meant that legally the board can take no action unless functioning as a corporate body in an official meeting. Anything done outside of this sphere is not binding on the part of the board nor the school system. Unfortunately, in many areas board members do wield a considerable amount of power as individuals, a power that can only be classified as gross misuse of their positions.

It was decided by the investigator to place school board policies under the category dealing with the operation of the school board for in all actuality, policies are the means by which the board does operate. Board policies could best be classified as guidelines. They should be rather broad in nature but not so broad as to lean toward vagueness. It is through their policies that boards maintain control of the local school system. The advantage to having sound,

clear board policies covering the major areas of school operation is that such policies clarify the boards position on all issues to the people. If these policies are a matter of public record, there should be no surprises on behalf of the board to upset the community.

Closely related to board policies are rules and regulations. There is, however, a distinction. Policies actually serve as the basis for the creation and writing of rules and regulations. Policies are usually general in nature and allow considerable leeway. While policies only point in the general direction of specific concerns, rules and regulations are concerned more with detail and specifics such as how, by whom, where, and when matters are to be handled. Basically, rules and regulations point out more exacting courses of action to be followed.

Another important element in the operation of the school board is the board meeting. As was mentioned previously, it is only when the board meets as a group in a duly called meeting that its actions are legal and binding. The significance of these board meetings is obvious in that it is only in these meetings that board members can discharge their responsibilities for public education in the school system.

A school board should have an agenda to follow at board meetings. The superintendent should be responsible for preparing the agenda. Any parties interested--the public, school personnel, students, or board members--in having certain items considered at a board meeting should submit the topic to the superintendent as far in advance of the meeting as is possible. This in turn gives the superintendent time to prepare the agenda and to distribute it among the board members, allowing them time for study and review.

A brief comment must be made when considering the operation of the board of education concerning board records. This subject has been covered in considerable detail earlier in the chapter, and no attempt is made to do so again at this point. The importance of these board records is mentioned to stress the point that the records of a school board serve as the documentary history of the school system and are evidence of board policies and action. In the case of court action, board records are extremely important because they record and reveal exactly what has been done and on what grounds action was taken. The minutes of the board meetings are the most important of all the board's records and should be complete and accurate. There are a number of other records which are vital to the legal and efficient operation of the school system. The budget and the school census are two good examples of such records.

Another excellent category for study in the board member training program discusses the powers and duties of boards of education. School boards in most states are vested with considerable authority concerning school matters in their school systems. This authority comes from the state and is based upon state authority to see that state responsibility for education is suitably achieved. School law in many cases does not specifically tell a board what it may and may not do. School boards, therefore, operate under considerable implied and discretionary authorities.

The current status of boards of education is the next major topic for the school board member training program. There are as many types of school boards as there are kinds of school systems, but most boards are in charge of basic administrative units. At one time

well over two thirds of all school boards were rural boards, a number which is decreasing at a fast pace. One point in time notes that there were four board members for every ten teachers. This number decreased to three for every ten teachers and is now considerably lower.

The size of school boards varies considerably, also. Boards range in size from three members to well over twelve members. The most common number of members on a school board is five or seven. Most contemporary board members are elected by popular vote in nonpartisan elections, but a number of board members who are appointed by city councils, mayors, or other officials or groups remain. From its earliest beginnings, membership on a school board has been considered a public service. This is reflected in the small number of board members who receive compensation for their services. Even in those situations where board members do receive some type of compensation, it is generally only enough to cover expenses or, at best, a very nominal amount.

Although the trend has changed somewhat in recent years, school boards have been comprised mainly of businessmen and professional people. The only area in which this statement has not held true has been in strictly rural areas where farmers have always made up a large percentage of the boards. Recently there has been a surge toward making boards more representative of those people which they serve. This attempt has been only partially successful.

A further topic for the board member training program could be concerned with the frustrations, pressures, and problems of holding such a position. This topic would be especially beneficial to the prospective board member for no one should seek a seat on a school

board without first becoming aware of the less desirable aspects of the job. Only then can a person decide if it is really a task he wants to assume. However, the more pleasant, enjoyable, and rewarding aspects of the position should not be ignored. Care must be taken to assure that prospective board members receive an unbiased view of the position which he or she seeks.

The needs of the individual board member constitute a vital topic for the school board member training program. Many training practices for board members place their major emphasis upon the operation of the schools and upon the functioning of the board itself. Very possibly, this is as it should be; however, some time and consideration should be given to the individual board member and his needs. Such topics as the strengths and weaknesses of board members and those practices which can assist the board member in enlarging and increasing his personal abilities could be classified as necessary areas to cover under this topic.

Every board member should receive a certain degree of training in the area of management skills and techniques. Here is another essential topic for the board member training program. A number of management skills and techniques that have been used successfully for years in business and industry can also prove to be very valuable to school boards in the operation of the public schools. Such techniques can not be of any aid to board members if the board members are unaware such techniques exist or are not familiar with just how they work. For example, every board member could benefit from instruction on group processes, decision-making, and systems analysis procedures, just to name a few. Such needed instruction could best be presented through a board member training program for these and other management skills

could then be taught from the viewpoint of a school board member with the public schools in mind.

An important category for inclusion in the board member training program concerns the board member as a state official. Most persons, including a number of board members, feel that a board member is an official of the local school system, and that the matter ends on such a belief. This concept is only partially correct. The board member is elected by the citizens of the local school system to represent them in the operation of the local public schools. If the entire truth is sought, it must be admitted that the school system is actually a civil subdivision of the state whose boundaries, and the methods for changing such boundaries, are provided for by state law. The local school system's primary concern is the state's function of education. Therefore, local board members are corporate officers, more specifically, local officers of the governmental corporation known as the school system or school district. The board as the governing body in each public school system depends upon the statutes of the state for a clarification of its administrative powers. This all important role must be understood by each prospective and active board member. Such an understanding can best be developed through a sound board member training program.

Every board member should be provided with certain basic information concerning education. The board member training program would be an excellent point for providing this essential information. Thus another sound topic for the board member training program arises. Learning certain basic concepts about education might at first glance appear as an elementary topic to include in a training program for school board members. Some persons might go so far as to state that

such study would be a waste of time. However, when one considers the reason for the existence of a school board in the first place, it must be agreed that a board's existence is vital for the education of the children of the community. Simply, a school board's business is education. Once board members are at least fairly well versed on such factors as history and philosophy of education, the language of education, and the ways and means of evaluating educational programs and personnel, such matters seem much less a waste of time. If a board member is to be able to function effectively in his job, he needs a firm background concerning certain basic information about education.

According to the findings of the study, one of the most important topics to include in a training program for school board members is school law. Educational writers, board members, and school administrators all seem to agree that the schools and their relationship to the law rank very near the peak of relevant issues confronting education today. The first area of concern here would involve making certain all board action was within the law. As was stated earlier, board action is legal only when the board meets as a group in a regular special meeting of which all members had been notified. Even then, unless a quorum is present at the meeting, all action taken by the board is invalid. Any action taken by an individual board member, unless acting as a duly chosen representative of the board and dealing with previous board action, is not legal. Should any question at all concerning the legality of any proposed board action arise, legal counsel should be sought or advice should be sought from the state department of education or the state attorney-general.

In addition to the matter of the legality of board action,

another relevant area of concern involving school law covers recent court actions. The public is no longer satisfied to remain inactive and permit school administrators and board members to run the schools any way they want to. More and more often, the citizenry and the school board are found engaged in legal involvements concerning various school matters. As was mentioned earlier, the old belief that a school board was immune to suit is gradually becoming a thing of the past.

Other issues involving the schools and the law that have found their way into the nation's courts include, for example, questions about the rights of school personnel and students. Teachers in recent years have become very active and militant. Do teachers have the right to strike and do they have a right to negotiate with the school board on various matters? Does the school board have the right to refuse to negotiate with teachers? These are but a few of the questions that have arisen. Students have also become more vocal in demanding certain rights and privileges. The students and their parents claim such rights are guaranteed by law and by the Constitution, but school boards and school systems have denied them these rights. Some of the issues that have appeared in relation to this matter are dress codes, cruel and unusual punishment, and the right to due process of the law.

The need for more legal counsel for school boards in the future is obvious. Only a few of the items and issues concerning school law that should be included in the training program for school board members have been discussed here. There are numerous other aspects concerning school law of which all board members should be informed. The findings of this study definitely point to the fact that

school law should be one of the first considerations for any board member training program.

No training program for board of education members could possibly be complete unless it included a study of school-community relationships. Every board member should be made aware of this essential topic. One of the major outcomes of the training in this area should be recognition by board members of the values of interacting school and community interpretation.

As has been covered previously, board members are official representatives of the state, but at the same time they are supposed to be representatives of their communities. After all, the schools belong to the people, all the people, and board members are the duly appointed or elected representatives of these people. Therefore, a close relationship between the schools and the community must be maintained at all times. This is the only way it can be truly said that the community honestly plays a role in the operation of the schools.

Such a wholesome school-community relationship is something that must be developed for it does not appear naturally. Unfortunately, much sincere, community interest goes unused by school boards and administrators largely because there are no regular channels for it. All school boards are urged to establish citizens' advisory committees. Such a committee of citizens interested in the schools can greatly increase the board's understanding of community needs and desires without binding the board by obligations. At the same time, such a committee can add to a board's stock of ideas on ways to meet these needs and desires.

Another area of school-community relationships which should be covered in a board member training program concerns criticism of

the school board. No school board should allow itself to be rushed into any unfair and unwise action by adverse criticism. Any individual or group that has a complaint or criticism should receive a fair and courteous hearing if he presents his statement in writing. When such a statement is made, the board should take no action until a complete and thorough investigation is made.

Boards can expect a multitude of unfounded criticisms which they can not afford to ignore, but neither should they allow themselves to become a party to them. Being a successful board member requires a considerable amount of diplomacy and personal fortitude. When all is considered, such a high order of public service as being a board member is surely worth the problems such a position faces. The board member needs all assistance available, assistance hopefully provided through the board member training program.

The next topic to be considered for the board member training program is the school board and curriculum and instruction. There are those who would declare that board members should not be concerned with the school system's curriculum and instruction. Such individuals state that board members are not trained in this area and should stay with their policy statements, salary schedules, and the like, leaving such matters to the professionals.

The only way to answer this argument is to say, "Ridiculous!" If the board is not concerned about and involved in the system's program of curriculum and instruction, then something or someone is in error. Again, the board's main reason for existing is the education of the children in its community. If the school system's curriculum and instruction is weak and irrelevant, then their sole

purpose is defeated.

Obviously, the board would want to involve students, teachers, administrators, parents, and any other interested persons in the planning and evaluation of the system's program of curriculum and instruction. A board member training program should acquaint board members with all important aspects of a good curriculum and instructional program. These persons would then be prepared to participate soundly in this all important area of the educational scene.

The relationship between the board and school finance emerged as the most important topic for the board member training program based on the findings of the study. The respondents to the Questionnaire, sent out by the investigator, chose school finance as the subject they felt should be included and stressed more fully than any other topic in the training program for school board members. This is understandable when the huge amount of money school boards are responsible for is considered.

It is no wonder that school boards, educators, and the public are highly interested in seeing to it that all this public money is put to proper use. Every board member should be thoroughly familiar with just where and how the finances for his system are obtained. Closely involved here would be a basic understanding of the local tax system. How a budget is prepared would be another vital area to cover. The state's minimum foundation program should go hand in hand with the system's annual budget and knowledge of it would be essential.

Other areas of interest to board members in the school finance realm would be teachers' salaries, salaries of other school personnel, and expenditures for equipment, supplies, and buildings. School

facilities demand a large portion of the system's budget, and the board should make certain that every dollar spent here is wisely spent or the cost of rebuilding in a few years could cause the system serious financial troubles. At this point, board members should be familiarized with capital outlay.

One other area which takes a big share of the school dollar is transportation. Whether a school operates its own transportation system or whether it contracts the service makes little difference; a tremendous amount of money is required to transport children to and from school. This fact is even more evident since the busing issue has gained nationwide attention. As for whether the system runs its own transportation system or not is a good topic in itself for the board member training program. Which method is the most efficient? Which method is the most economical? Only a few of the most important areas concerning school finance have been covered here, but it is obvious that it is a most relevant and most important topic for discussion and consideration and should be included in the board member training program.

Before leaving the area of school finance, one further matter should be mentioned. Regardless of what aspect of the school program is considered, the fact always remains that a board member's major concern should be the children and providing them with a quality education. It would be irresponsible to state that money is the only solution, or even the major one, for obtaining a quality education program. At the same time, it would be just as ridiculous to suggest that a school system attempt to operate without money. Through the wise and proper use of school finances, a board can accomplish great

strides toward making available to every child an excellent educational opportunity. The ability to manage and use school finances, as well as evaluate the results of this use, does not come naturally, and board members should receive such instruction through the training program for school board members.

The various facilities of a school system, including school construction projects, buildings, supplies, equipment, maintenance, and facility planning, make an excellent topic for inclusion in the school board training program. Just what are some of the areas that board members become involved in concerning school facilities? First, it should be repeated that school facilities demand a large share of the system's finances, and school facilities have a big influence on the kind of educational program that can be offered by a school system. Therefore, a considerable amount of consideration and care should be given this all important area.

The communications role of the board of education is the next topic to be included in the training program for school board members. This role is surely one of the most important ones a board assumes. Communications must be kept open between the board and all other individuals and groups who have an interest in the school system. First, all members of the board must be able to communicate effectively with each other if they are to work as a team. The superintendent is a key person in improving communications between the board and all others who have an interest in the schools.

The board must also remain in close communication with all school personnel and with the students. Many problems and potential disasters can be avoided or quickly solved if the board will just

communicate honestly with these persons. Even though they are not directly involved in a particular school system's affairs, a school board would be wise to communicate regularly with such organizations as the United States Office of Education, the National School Boards Association, the state school boards associations, and the state department of education. Last in the list, but by no means the least important aspect, is the board's responsibility to keep the communication channels open between themselves and the community which they serve. After all, the board is serving as representatives of the citizens of its school system. It is the board's duty to keep the public well informed of the operations in their schools, and, at the same time, to be receptive to any suggestions, complaints, or compliments that might come from the community. It is only when the communication lines are efficiently functioning that the system's schools can honestly be called public schools--schools of all the people.

The next category for inclusion in the board member training program is school board-superintendent relations. The superintendent is the professional head of a school system and is, therefore, the professional staff member with whom the school board has most contact. Administrators receive considerable training in the area of school board-superintendent relations in their professional schooling as well as through administrators' conferences and meetings. Board members in many cases receive very little training in this area.

The board should always remember that its chief functions are planning, legislation, evaluation, and interpretation; the superintendent's major function is execution. As long as both parties are

aware of these functions and understand them thoroughly, there should be no problem. A good superintendent can even make the board's work much easier through his conscientious effort to cooperate and help.

School board-staff relations are another essential topic for the board member training program. The board's relationship with school personnel other than the superintendent should be an area of great concern by the school board. Generally, the board does not have a great deal of contact with school personnel apart from the superintendent and his immediate staff. As a rule, when there is a problem or a matter for consideration, the recognized channels of administrative procedure should be followed. Concurrently, the board should be accessible to those who have complaints which have gone unnoticed and to those who have suggestions but have been unable to get their administrators and supervisors to listen.

School boards might be surprised at the contributions school personnel could make in areas such as policy-making and problem-solving if they only had the opportunity. Many boards have recognized the potential in this area and have included teachers, principals, and other employees as members of various councils and committees. The main area in which such individuals work is that of personnel problems, but there is no reason why they can not be of assistance in other areas also.

One of the many factors board members must deal with in their jobs is interest groups. The school board's relationship with these interest groups and how it should deal with them is an excellent topic for the board member training program. Interest groups are comprised of those individuals who advocate a certain position or who want to

achieve some particular goal. They exist in all areas of community life, and the school system is no exception. Some of these groups operate openly and everyone recognizes them. In many other cases, these persons operate behind the scenes, and very few people know much about them.

Where the school system is concerned, interest groups are organized to exert influence on school issues. Sometimes more than one interest group will work together on some matter. Interest groups often go so far as to run their own candidates for the school board or at least support individuals who are sympathetic toward their views. Board members should always remember that they represent all the people of their school system and not one or two factions or interest groups. If they act otherwise, they are being unethical and abusing the power entrusted to them.

Just the same, the school board can not turn a deaf ear to these interest groups. Some of them very possibly have legitimate complaints or suggestions. Even if they do not, the board owes them the courtesy of hearing their plans. How about those that work entirely behind the scenes? Board members must be aware of the fact that such groups exist and should be ready to deal with any situation that arises.

What sort of a relationship should the school board have with the news media? This question contains the elements of the next topic to be included in the board member training program. The news media can be either of great assistance to the school board or the largest anxiety a board ever had. The board needs to maintain a sound relationship with the local newspapers, radio stations, and television stations

if at all possible. The best way to do this is to be honest and open with them. Inviting media representatives to all open board meetings and informing them of all important school news are among the means of maintaining a good relationship with the news media.

It is not meant here that the school board should cater to the media. What is meant is that the news media should be respected as voices of the people that keep the community informed on all relevant matters. Anything of significance that happens in the school system and is public in nature falls into this category. In all such cases, the board should do everything in its power to cooperate with the local news media. The worst mistake a school board could make would be to ignore the media, be disrespectful toward it, or underestimate the power and influence these organs have.

The next topic for the training program for school board members was discussed thoroughly in the first part of this chapter. This topic is school boards associations. Since it was covered extensively earlier, only a brief discussion of the matter was undertaken at this point. Even though there are school boards associations at the local, state, and national level, the one that has been the most benefit to school boards over the years is the state school boards association. These organizations have as their purpose the strengthening and improvement of school board service.

School boards associations have proven themselves at all levels. They are not interested, as some critics have claimed, in controlling the technical and professional aspects of educational administration. There is much that these organizations can do for board members and the schools themselves without encroaching on the realm of the school

administrator. The interested superintendent will encourage the members of his board to be active in school boards associations at all levels and to take part in their programs and activities. Participation in these organizations is one area that should be stressed in the board member training program.

Accountability has already been hinted at in relation with various other subjects in this chapter, but because of its relevance and importance, it was decided to include accountability in the board member training program as a separate topic of its own. In terms of the public schools, when someone or some group is held accountable for its decisions or actions, it is then said to be responsible for these decisions or actions. Most persons involved with education feel that board members, administrators, and teachers have always been accountable to the public and to themselves for their actions. In the past few years, the word accountability itself has become quite popular. Nevertheless, it must be admitted that parents, students, and all other interested individuals have become more active in school matters and more readily insistent that school officials justify their decisions and actions affecting the school system. This is as it should be, and board members should always be prepared to explain satisfactorily any move made involving the schools to the public they serve. The board member training program should help board members understand this situation and help prepare them to handle the matter.

How the school board should handle controversial issues is another excellent topic for the board member training program. One immediate solution to this problem would be to ignore and avoid all controversial matters. In other words, if a matter is touchy, stay

away from it. Obviously this is not the best solution to any problem. Just because an issue is ignored does not mean it will go away or resolve itself. In most cases, avoiding such a matter will only make it worse.

The best way to handle any controversial issue is to bring it out into the open and deal with it. The best position the school board can take when any of the more explosive issues, such as sex education and integration, arise is to ask all sides to present their views and arguments. The board should proceed with an investigation of the matter and after careful consideration should come to a decision. This decision of course must take the law into consideration and be in agreement with all statutes, rules, and regulations by which the board is bound. Once a decision is reached, it must be announced to the public complete with a full explanation and interpretation of the decision. Even then there will be some disagreement and dissatisfaction, but at least the board will know it did its best and acted in good conscience. Consideration of a topic such as this one in the board member training program could very well save a lot of board members considerable heart-ache and trouble.

A board member training program would not be complete if the board's responsibility for setting goals and evaluating the school program were not included as a topic for study. Just carrying through with day-by-day, routine activities is not enough. The board must, with the help and cooperation of the superintendent, other school personnel, students, and the community, set goals for the school system. These goals must always have as their ultimate objective the improvement of educational opportunities for the system's children. Such

considerations as financial ability and lasting value must be carefully looked at when setting goals. Once a goal has been decided upon, the board should follow through with it until it is achieved unless new evidence suggests otherwise.

The school board's responsibility does not end here however. The board is also responsible for continuous evaluation of the system's educational program. Through continuous evaluation the board may modify some goals, drop others, and set still others. It is only through such appraisal that a school board can know just how sound their school program really is. Of course, this evaluative procedure must include an assessment of the superintendent and all other school personnel. The school board's responsibility for evaluation and appraisal was mentioned earlier when board functions were considered, but the need to emphasize it again in relation to the board's responsibility for setting goals was felt.

The resolution of conflict is something about which every board member is concerned. Therefore, it is an obvious choice for the board member training program. School board conflicts with the superintendent, the teachers, the students, the community, and various others are inevitable. It is not these conflicts which cause board members problems; it is the method by which these conflicts are handled and, eventually, solved which could cause problems. Most persons would agree that experience is an invaluable aide in handling problems. Further, it seems obvious that the veteran school board member should possess the experience to control or solve most conflicts facing the board. However, the gaining of this experience can be a very painful, and in some cases destructive, confrontation with the community, local

groups, and special persons. Much of the conflict facing a board appears to develop through misconceptions, misunderstandings, lack of information, and a general breakdown in communications. It is obvious that the school board training program should do everything possible to prepare school board members in this area.

An essential topic for the board member training program would be teaching board members to look beyond their own locality at the needs and inclinations of society as a whole. By doing this the board members would, hopefully, see certain trends in society which would definitely affect the educational services provided by the schools. Board members should be careful observers and interpreters of conditions in their own community, but this observation is not enough. Board members should broaden their vision to the point that they are looking at education from a national standpoint or even from an international standpoint.

Yet another basic topic selected for the board member training program is the improvement of school board service. Obviously, if this can be done, board members should receive information on how board service can be strengthened and improved. A sound position from which to dispense such information would be the board members training program. Any individual who has studied the situation would have to admit that much progress has been made in the area of board service in recent years. One of the factors which has helped further the progress of board service has been clearer and more exacting definitions of board functions, duties, and responsibilities. No pretense is made that the job is complete. This is especially true with new board members continually entering the service. The fact is that the better

the role of board members and school boards is defined and the wider the definition of this role is agreed upon, the easier it will be to improve board service and the faster it will come about.

One area where school board service might be improved is through better selection of candidates for the school board. Little has been done to improve the methods of selecting board candidates over the years. All one has to do in most areas to become a board candidate is to file for candidacy or, in some cases, a supporter or group of supporters may file for the prospective board member. Possibly this is the best method, but the point is that there has been practically no study nor investigation to support or reject this method. Also, there have been very few alternative plans tried or tested. It would seem that a person seeking a position of such extreme importance to the nation's children and to the well being of society in general should command the support and interest of a greater representation of the public than existing methods make possible. Critics state that in those elections where board members are elected by the people, an individual can not be elected unless he has a considerable amount of support from the community. This is true, but what kind of a choice did the voter have when he went to the polls? This is the whole issue--to give citizens a better choice when they go to elect the members of their school board.

The major areas of concern here are the setting up of machinery for democratically bringing out and then putting to use community interests and feelings. Once again, no position was taken in this study. It is probable that the present method of selecting board candidates is preferable. What is intended at this point is to stimulate thought concerning the situation and, at the very least, to

consider the pros as well as the cons of alternative methods. What better place to do this study than in the board member training program?

Another means by which school board service might be improved, and the method upon which this entire study is based, is through the orientation or training of school board members. Concerning others of the need for such training and how it can improve school board service is a large task. All those persons who advocate such training and orientation should strive diligently to insure that these concepts become an accepted part of their school system and should also work to see to it that training practices are continually reviewed and improved. One way to increase the number of supporters of school board training is to explain and stress the importance of such training in board training programs themselves. Some persons might label this practice indoctrination; however, such a practice reflects insight and practicality.

Obviously if the competence of board members could be improved, school board service itself then would almost certainly show improvement. Probably the largest factor involved in the improvement of board member competence is the leadership of the superintendent. Other sources available to board members in need of help are state education departments, colleges and universities, and various professional organizations. Very possibly the organization which contributes most to the improvement of board member competence is the state school boards association, as well as school board associations at other levels.

The final topic to be discussed in relation to the training

program for school board members might be labelled new directions for the school board. As has been stressed a number of times previously in this study, local school boards today are confronted with extreme public demands which cause considerable tension and strain on the part of board members. Some board members, in addition to facing emotional strain, have actually suffered physical harm in trying to perform their duties. Examples of the pressures that have led to the troubles board members are facing today include the increased militancy of students and teachers and the increased emphasis placed on quality education. These causes in themselves may be commendable; however, the zeal with which some of these ideas are pushed can lead to trouble. These issues and many more will be present to test the board member in coming years, and it will be part of his job to handle these situations in a sane, sensible manner. Serving as a school board member taxes the ability of the strongest and the best of humans. Special techniques are needed to prepare the board member to meet emerging social demands as well as to prepare him to deal with the various groups who would change the schools so as to meet their own selfish desires rather than the interests of the children of the country. It stands to reason that board members must be trained and prepared to cope with the new directions in which school boards are heading. Such training could best be provided through the board member training program.

The above discussion concludes the section of the preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members concerning which competency areas should be included in such a program. It is not claimed that every possible topic for the board member training program was discussed in this section. Based upon the findings of

the study, the topics that were included were those found to generate the most interest and concern. Any other relevant subject that appears to be of value might also be included in the program. Also, it was not claimed that the categories discussed in this section of Chapter 5 were pure categories. There was admittedly a considerable amount of overlapping between topics. Neither was there any attempt made to list all important items under any topic. Rather, it was the purpose of this part of the training program to list the major categories to be studied and then to discuss a few of the major ideas associated with each. These ideas also came from the findings of the study. Several volumes could be written on any one of the major topics such as school finance. The time of the school board training program's presentation is the time to expand upon each individual concept or idea.

6. How should the training program be conducted?

Once the task of describing those particular topics and areas of study which should be included in a training program for school board members was completed, the next step and the last major area of the training program dealt with the question, "How?" The purpose of this section was to describe clearly the methods by which a successful training program for board of education members should be conducted.

Once the findings of the study concerning the location at which the training program for school board members should be held, by whom it should be conducted, what type of speakers should be used, when it should be offered, and how long it should last were analyzed and evaluated, the answer to the question of how the program should be conducted was quite obvious.

First, the findings indicated that the most favorable location

to conduct a board member training program was a college or university. As for the persons who should conduct the program, it was concluded from the findings that the superintendent and the state school boards association were the best choices. For reasons stated at that time, the state school boards association was designated as the party which should sponsor the preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members. The findings of the study pointed to professional speakers as being the types of speakers which should be used in the program. The last two areas covered dealt with when a training program for school board members should be offered and the time span it should cover. The conclusion based upon the findings of the study disclosed that the training program should begin as early as possible, even before election or appointment of members if feasible, and continue for as long as an individual remained a board member.

When the above findings of the study were considered as a whole, it was concluded that the answer to the question, "How?" had to be answered by the use of the conference method. This seemed the logical choice since the findings of the study indicated the desire and need for frequent training sessions of a few hours duration rather than a singular training session of a much longer duration. These shorter training sessions would be presented on a regular basis and would be continuous in nature in the respect that there would be no such thing as a final or end session. The reasoning here could be likened to the old saying that no person is ever completely educated. There is always something left to learn. The same logic holds true for board members. No board member is ever totally trained in every respect. This is true even if he has been participating in board member training

sessions for many years. There will always be something new he needs to learn or something to be presented through current materials. It was with these thoughts in mind that the following area of the preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members was developed.

Once all other areas of the preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members, including the section on competency areas to be included in such a program, were developed, the conference situation was selected as the method best suited for presenting such a program. The planning and development of the conference should be based upon those goals which are hoped to be attained. The conference should be developed so that it will meet the needs of the participants, allow them maximum opportunity for participation, sharing of experience, and optimum use of the resources possessed by the participants.

The next step in this section was to decide upon exactly what aspects compose a conference and how one is presented. The conference itself can take a number of different forms. One form is the work conference. It is generally used for planning, fact finding, or problem solving. The work conference consists of general sessions as well as face-to-face meetings. High participation is a must for a successful work conference. The workshop is another type of conference and its purpose is for training. It also consists of both general sessions and face-to-face contact. The resources of the workshop are often the participants themselves. Further, the clinic is used for clinical investigation of some particular topic. Here the clinic leaders attempt to train the participants in some area or areas. Clinics provide mostly face-to-face opportunities for participants but may include some general sessions.

Another form of the conference method is the seminar. The participants in a seminar generally are considered to be individuals of considerable experience in the field of interest. The emphasis here is on gaining knowledge through shared experiences. The seminar involves a considerable amount of participation by all those taking part and much of the activity is on a face-to-face basis. The seminar leader serves a double purpose. He is not only the content expert of the session but also serves as the discussion leader. The institute is another type of conference that is used for training purposes. In this situation general sessions are used to a large degree with at least some face-to-face meetings. The institute staff usually provides the majority of the resources and instruction. The last major type of conference is commonly referred to as the convention. The convention generally is used by various groups and organizations for their annual meetings. General sessions and committee meetings heavily dominate the convention. Conventions are largely for presenting information and voting on various issues. Smaller groups may be used within the general session itself.

In addition to these major forms of the conference method, there are, of course, the small group meetings. These are aimed at groups of a few individuals, but with the exception of their small size they basically follow the guidelines for one or more of the above methods. As to which conference method should be used, the decision would depend on the material to be presented, the type of training desired, and to a great extent the participants themselves.

Each particular conference method has a number of alternative groupings. The most obvious type of grouping is the general session

or total group. General sessions can be used for presenting new information, theory, resolutions, principles, and policies. Committee reports, voting, and all official business can be handled more effectively by the total group than by any other type of grouping.

Sometimes, the use of small groups should be considered for the conference. If the topic being considered concerns possible solutions to a controversial problem or, perhaps, the future course of action to be taken by a group, the decision then must be made as to whether it can best be dealt with in a general session or in a small group. The advantage of using smaller groups lies in the fact that more persons can participate actively in the learning process. Some of the same factors must be considered when making decisions on the type of grouping to be used as was considered when deciding on the type of conference method to employ. Once again those taking part in the conference, the type of training to be dispensed, and the nature of the material to be presented all must be analyzed before any decision can be made.

When the time comes for actually scheduling the conference, certain information must be gathered first. Among other things, such items as the fatigue factor, the attitude of the participants toward each topic, the relationship to other topics on the agenda, the types of resources needed, and the methods chosen must be carefully considered. Before the schedule is finalized, it must be decided at which point each item will best fit into the conference. The interest of the participants in each topic and the importance of each topic to them can not be overlooked. Before a topic is scheduled to be included in the conference, it should be affirmed that the topic relates to the

objectives of the conference. The degree of familiarity with a topic and the amount of knowledge about a given topic that the participants have is always useful to know. The amount of participation desired is another matter that must be decided ahead of time.

Not only the kind of groups must be decided upon, but also it must be decided just how these groups should be divided. Should a particular type of individual be in one group and another type in another group? Should the groups be mixed? For the purposes of the conference, does it really matter how the groups are formed? The types of and amounts of resources and materials needed to meet the goals of the conference must also be agreed upon. These and other questions must be answered before the conference schedule can be developed.

Once the decision has been made on what material will be presented in the conference and what type of grouping will be used, the next problem is one of how to present the material. It must be determined for the small group meetings just how much information the speaker will present in relation to the amount of time spent in group discussion by the participants. As for the general session or total group meeting, the question concerns just how this larger session will be handled. There are a number of choices for this type of meeting. Once again, the nature of the material and the situation in which it is presented will help determine the most effective method. Basically, there is no one "right way" to conduct the general session. The correct method for a particular conference is the way that will best achieve the goals and objectives of that conference.

One of the most popular methods of conducting the general

session of a conference is the speaker method. He may lecture to the group or he may use visual aids to help clarify his presentation. Other widely used techniques for total group meetings include demonstrations, skits or other dramatic actions, panel, symposiums, debates, forums, and films or television.

For a conference to be successful, ample opportunity for participation must be provided. Most individuals who take part in a conference not only want to actively participate but also expect a chance to do so. One good way to do this has already been discussed; that is the dividing of the large group into a number of small groups. The secret to the success of the small group is the small group leader. He must be skilled in leading discussions. At the same time, he must be able to stimulate and encourage active participation by all group members.

The small group is not the only means of increasing participation at the conference. Question periods can be very effective in increasing participation. For a question period to work, it must be carefully scheduled. Adequate time must be allotted and it must be scheduled at the appropriate time in the conference. The participants must be adequately prepared to ask questions also. This may be accomplished by informing the group at the beginning of the general session that there will be a question period. This way participants can write down any questions as they think of them. Otherwise, they may forget all their questions except those having to do with the last part of the presentation. The most important aspect to keep in mind here is that if a question period is to be included in the conference, it should be considered an important part of the program. Otherwise, it should

not be included.

The buzz group is another excellent way of increasing participation in the conference. A buzz group generally consists of six to ten people. Its main purpose is to stimulate broad participation on a limited subject as quickly as possible. Instructions must be carefully and clearly given if the buzz group is to succeed. These small sessions generally do not last over ten or fifteen minutes. Buzz groups do not need chairmen, but they do need a reporter to take notes of the discussion and report to the main group. Each buzz group should be told when to begin, how much time they will have, and a warning before the time period ends. While the buzz groups are in session, members of the conference staff should check to see that each group is proceeding correctly and clear up any misunderstandings if needed.

There are several other techniques for increasing participation in the conference. One is the listening team. This situation involves participants who are divided into two or three groups before the program begins. Each group is then instructed to listen to the presentation and later react to it from a particular point of view. For example, if the school board members in a board member training program are listening to a presentation on school finance, then part of the board members could look at the matter from the viewpoint of the school board, another group from the viewpoint of the superintendent, and a third group from the viewpoint of taxpayers. Very similar to listening teams are observing teams. Observing teams also look at a situation from several points of view, but instead of listening to a speaker or speakers, they are actually observing a

demonstration or some real life event. They also report their findings or questions back to the main group.

The interview panel can also be put to excellent use for increasing participation at the conference. A panel of participants representing a cross section of the positions and beliefs of the entire group is chosen. The panel then interviews the speaker or speakers from the point of view of their own group. A very similar group of participants may serve as a reaction panel for the conference. These individuals also represent a cross section of the population involved in the conference. The job of the reaction panel is to ask questions at any time during the talk or program. The purpose of the panel members is to ask questions on matters or points they think might be troubling or confusing the group they represent. Their personal questions, unless meeting this guideline, are to be saved until later. One last possible device for increasing conference participation is called "Phillips 66" and is named for its developer. In this situation, three persons from each row face three individuals from the adjoining row forming a group of six. These six people are then given six minutes to discuss some issue and reach a decision.

Once it has been decided upon what topics are to be studied, the type of grouping to be used, how the material will be presented, and what methods will be used to increase participation, then the resources needed for carrying out these objectives at the conference must be determined. Speakers, panel members and chairmen, discussion leaders, subject matter experts, recorders, and reporters are good examples of the type of program resources that probably will be needed for the conference. One of the above listed resources, all of the

above resources, or all of the above resources plus others may be required for a particular conference. These resources were called program resources because they were needed for the actual presentation of the conference program itself. An addition to these would be the regular conference staff who would take care of such tasks as publicity for the conference, registration of participants, and preparation of the actual physical setting for the conference. When planning a conference, it is very important to keep these two functions clearly separated. This does not mean though that some individuals may not have assignments in both categories.

If it is possible, some of the program resources should be involved in planning the conference. In many cases this is not possible nor feasible because the conference sponsors have little or no contact with the conference participants and program resources before the conference itself takes place. Every effort should be made to contact the speakers for the conference as far in advance as possible allowing them to be involved in the planning and to become perfectly familiar with the whole setup. At the same time, they will also feel like it is "their" conference and not just one they are attending. Additional pluses in involving the speakers and other program resources in planning the conference are that it spreads out the responsibility, makes the planning more decentralized, and causes more people to be concerned about the success of the conference.

Discussion leaders and recorders and reporters for small groups can be selected at the conference itself. One good way to involve all the participants in at least some of the planning is to let each group choose its own recorder, reporter, and the like. Even

a seemingly minor move like this can help participants feel like they are really a part of the conference.

The above discussion completes the section on the method by which a training program for school board members should be conducted. Based upon the findings of the study, the answer was obviously the conference method. The various kinds of conferences and how they should be conducted have been carefully discussed above. Each individual session of the training program will need to be planned separately. Whether the seminar or clinic is used, the type of grouping, and so on will have to be determined for each session based on the nature of the material and the situation in which it is being presented. To maintain high interest and motivation, a variety might be a good answer. The fact is that getting ready for a conference is a complex process and becoming more so all the time. The key to the success of any conference though is careful planning. Only through such planning can any conference expect to accomplish its purposes and meet its objectives.

The preservice and/or inservice training program for board of education members has now been developed. It is not claimed that this program is a panacea and should be adopted verbatim by all those interested in providing training for school board members. Rather, this training program should serve as a foundation upon which interested parties could base their own programs. Every situation is different, and each individual board member training program should be determined by the needs of the group undergoing the training. It is hoped by this investigator that the preservice and/or inservice training program developed through this study can serve as a model for

all individuals and groups interested in providing training for school board members in their particular region or areas.

In summarizing the preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members, it should be stressed that the entire program was based primarily on the findings of the study itself. Every effort was made to keep the personal biases and opinions of the investigator from influencing the development of the training program. Before the training program itself was presented, a section of Chapter 5 was devoted to primary areas of concern by the superintendent for school board members. It was admitted that there could not help but be some overlapping between this section and the training program.

The first part of the preservice and/or inservice training program for board of education members was concerned with the location at which the program should be held. According to the findings of the study, the preferred location was considered to be a college or university. The next area of the training program dealt with the question of who should offer the program. There was some basis for choosing both the superintendent and the state school boards association, but when the findings of the study were searched for an answer, the state school boards association got the nod.

The next matter to be considered in the development of the board member training program was the type of speakers that should be used in such a program. The findings of the study heavily favored professional speakers over lay speakers for this task. When the training program should be offered and how long it should last was the next problem to be dealt with. Based upon the findings of the study the training program should be started as early as possible,

before election or appointment if at all possible. As for the length of the program, the answer was that the training program should be continuous, lasting as long as an individual is a school board member. The findings of the study definitely rejected any idea that some kind of preservice training program should be required of all prospective school board members. At the same time, the findings indicated that such a training was desirable and should be encouraged of all school board members but should be left on a voluntary basis.

Another extremely important area of the board member training program was concerned with just what competency areas should be included in such a program. No attempt was made to list every single important idea or competency that might be included in the board member training program. Such a task would have been an impossibility since several volumes could be written on any one of the major areas of importance. Instead, based upon the findings of the study, the various ideas and suggestions for the board member training program were organized into major categories. Each category was then discussed in some detail including some of the major concepts and ideas belonging under each one. Based upon the findings of the study, the category or topic that created the most interest for inclusion in the board member training program was the school board and school finance.

The last area of the training program for board of education members described just how a successful program of this nature should be conducted. By taking all the other areas of the training program into consideration and by analyzing the findings of the study, it was concluded that the best answer to the question, "How?", had to be the conference method. This seemed to be the obvious choice since

the findings of the study indicated the desire and need for frequent training sessions of a few hours duration as compared to a singular training session of a much longer duration. These shorter training sessions using the conference approach would be presented on a regular basis and would be continuous in nature in the respect that there would not be a final or end session. The remainder of the section was then devoted to a discussion of the various types of conferences and how they should be planned and conducted. The most important aspect of a successful conference was found to be careful planning.

Once again it must be stated that the preservice and/or inservice training program for board of education members contained in this chapter should not be adopted as is by any person or group interested in providing training for the school board members in their own areas. Instead, this program should be used as a model on which to base their own program, taking into careful consideration the needs of the particular group of board members to be trained. Once the preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members was developed, it was field tested on a group of board members and prospective board members. The results of that field testing situation are reported in the latter part of this chapter.

In addition to presenting the preservice and/or inservice training program for board of education members developed by this investigator, Chapter 5 also dealt with the seventh question of the study stated in Chapter 1. This seventh question was: What would such a preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members consist of? The answer to this seventh question is found in the various sections of the chapter. Basically, the answer to the

seventh question is the preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members itself which is contained in Chapter 5.

RESULTS OF THE FIELD TESTING SITUATION

The preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members was not developed before the presentation of Chapter 5. Therefore, the eighth question dealing with the field testing of the program could not be tested in Chapter 4 along with the other questions. It was the purpose of this section of Chapter 5 to present the results of the field testing situation as well as deal with the eighth question. The eighth question asked: How effective is the preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members when tested under actual working conditions?

Before this study was begun, it was decided by this investigator that the simple developing of a preservice and/or inservice training program for board of education members was not enough. It was felt that once the program was developed it would have to be tested under actual working conditions before any realistic claims could be made. Once the program was developed, based upon the findings of the study, it took the form of an open-ended, continuous program. Based upon the findings of the study, the most desirable vehicle to present the program proved to be the conference, workshop, or seminar method. It was not difficult to determine that presenting such a program in its entirety would be impossible for the simple reason that such an open-ended, continuous program has no end. Therefore, it was decided by this investigator to test only one segment of the program. Specifically, a workshop was planned and presented to a group of school

board members and prospective board members.

It was decided to conduct the workshop in the state of Tennessee because Tennessee was the focal point of the study itself. The workshop was held on Thursday, June 27, 1974, on the campus of East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee. Since the training program was developed for both prospective board members and board members already serving, it was felt that a valid testing situation could only be achieved if a cross section of both groups was included in the workshop.

To achieve this goal, a massive publicity campaign was undertaken in the East Tennessee area. All board members in the twenty-two school systems of East Tennessee received a letter of invitation (Appendix E) to the workshop. The superintendents in these systems also received a notice (Appendix F) explaining the workshop. The workshop was announced on four television stations, four radio stations, and in ten newspapers in the East Tennessee area. The media advertising the workshop can be found in Tables 35, 36, and 37. Copies of the letters sent to the above stations and newspapers appear in Appendixes G and H. The last major method of publicizing the workshop was the posting of twenty-four workshop announcements in the Education Building of East Tennessee State University--the site of the workshop. These announcements were placed in locations most likely to be seen. A copy of this announcement can be found in Appendix I.

Table 35
Television Stations Announcing Workshop

Station	Location
WJHL	Johnson City, Tennessee
WCYB	Bristol, Virginia
WKPT	Kingsport, Tennessee
WSJK	East Tennessee State University Johnson City, Tennessee

Table 36
Radio Stations Announcing Workshop

Station	Location
WJCW	Johnson City, Tennessee
WETB	Johnson City, Tennessee
WJSO	Johnson City, Tennessee
WETS	East Tennessee State University Johnson City, Tennessee

On June 27, 1974, twenty-one persons, twelve board members and nine prospective board members, participated in the workshop. These data are capsuled in Table 38. There were also six workshop staff members involved in the session. This investigator was in charge of the overall program and the investigator's wife, Whitcomb K. Calloway, was responsible for the refreshments. The four resource persons who took part in the workshop were as follows: Dr. Clinton Moody, East Tennessee State University; Mr. Jim Counts, Tennessee Department of

Table 37

Newspapers Announcing Workshop

Newspaper	Location
Bristol Herald Courier	Bristol, Virginia
Elizabethton Star	Elizabethton, Tennessee
Erwin Record	Erwin, Tennessee
The Greeneville Sun	Greeneville, Tennessee
Herald and Tribune	Jonesboro, Tennessee
Johnson City Press Chronicle	Johnson City, Tennessee
Kingsport News	Kingsport, Tennessee
Rogersville Review	Rogersville, Tennessee
Sullivan County News	Blountville, Tennessee
The Tomahawk	Mountain City, Tennessee

Education; Mr. Max Harrison, Tennessee Department of Education; and Mr. Mack Pierce, Tennessee Department of Education.

Table 38
Workshop Participants

Classification	Number
Board Members	12
Prospective Board Members	9
Total	21

The workshop began at 6:00 p.m. The topics dealt with at the workshop were "The School Board Member and School Law," "The School Board Member and School Finance," "The School Board Member and Board Policy," and "The School Board Member and Buildings and Equipment." The basis for selecting these topics was question 7 of the Questionnaire sent to superintendents, board chairmen, and selected board members. According to the respondents to the Questionnaire the above four topics were among the most important as far as consideration for a board member orientation program was concerned. This information can be found in Tables 9 and 10 which were discussed in Chapter 4.

Dr. Clinton Moody was the group leader for discussion of the topic, "The School Board Member and School Law," while Mr. Jim Counts lead the group considering "The School Board Member and School Finance," Mr. Max Harrison, leader for "The School Board Member and Board Policy" group, and Mr. Mack Pierce, group leader for study of "The School Board Member and Buildings and Equipment," guided their study groups.

During the introductory session, a pretest was given to the participants; a posttest was given them in the concluding session. These tests are dealt with in considerable detail at a later point in this section. The opening session of the workshop lasted from 6:00 p.m. to 6:45 p.m. Along with the pretest, the workshop agenda was explained at this time, and the twenty-one participants were divided into four small groups--three groups with five members and one group with six members. At 6:45 p.m. each group met with a different leader for a forty-five minute session. At 7:30 p.m. groups changed leaders and met until the break at 8:15 p.m. Refreshments were then served. At 8:30 p.m. the third small group meeting began and lasted until 9:15 p.m. The last small group session ran from 9:15 p.m. until 10:00 p.m. By this time all four small groups had had the opportunity to meet with each of the four resource persons and to discuss each of the four workshop topics. The concluding session with all participants back together again began at 10:00 p.m. Among other things, the posttest was given at this time. The workshop was adjourned at 10:30 p.m. A workshop schedule which clearly summarizes the above information about the workshop can be found in Appendix J.

As for the method by which each resource person would conduct his portion of the workshop, a decision was made after several conferences with each of these persons. At these meetings, the findings of the study up to this point were discussed. Each resource person had his own comments and suggestions concerning the workshop. In the end it was decided to allow each resource person to conduct his small group sessions for the workshop using whatever method or methods he preferred. The only limitation was that each person stay within the

scope and framework of the program schedule and agenda.

The last major subject to be considered concerning the workshop was the pretest (Appendix K) and the posttest (Appendix L) themselves. The purpose of administering these tests was to provide some concrete evidence to support the effectiveness, or lack of it, of the training program for board members and prospective board members. As there were no appropriate tests available for this purpose, this investigator developed a pretest and posttest especially for this occasion. The tests dealt with the school board member and his relationship to school law, school finance, board policy, and buildings and equipment. The pretest and posttest are composed of the same number of questions or items. For every question on the pretest, there is an equivalent item on the posttest. Of course, these equivalent items cover the same basic idea, concept, or meaning, but they appear in entirely different forms on the two tests.

As for the basis upon which the investigator devised the development of the pretest and posttest, the answer is basic to the study. The tests were based upon the findings of the study itself with special emphasis placed on the Questionnaire sent to superintendents, board chairmen, and selected board members. It was felt that the most appropriate study of the basic competencies needed by a board member could be obtained and incorporated into the pretest and posttest by this process.

As stated earlier, there were twenty-one persons who participated in the workshop. Twelve of these individuals were board members; nine were prospective board members. This breakdown was obtained by having the participants to check the appropriate blank ("_____ I am a

board member" or "_____ I am a prospective board member") on the first page of both the pretest and posttest.

After all participants had arrived, the workshop began by this investigator personally welcoming each person. The four resource persons were then introduced to the group. The program schedule (Appendix J) had been written on the board at the front of the room ahead of time, and hand copies of the schedule were made available. The schedule was explained to the group, and questions were answered. As was mentioned earlier, the large group was then divided into four small groups by simply having the participants to count off one through four. There were five members in each of three groups and six members in the fourth.

The next step in the workshop was the administering of the pretest. The following statements were made by this investigator as a means of introducing the pretest:

At this time I am going to pass out a questionnaire which we would like each of you to complete. Its purposes is to provide some important information for the workshop staff. It is not necessary for you to sign your questionnaire, but if you will look in the upper right hand corner of the first page, you will notice a number. Please write this number some place because it is your number for this workshop, and you will need it later in the program. Read the directions carefully before starting, and please do not forget to indicate whether you are a board member or a prospective board member by marking the correct blank in the middle of the first page. There is no time limit on the questionnaire, but we would appreciate it if you would work as quickly and carefully as possible. Are there any questions? If you have any questions while you are working on the questionnaire, please raise your hand, and I will try to help you. If there are no further comments or questions, you may begin.

The only questions asked were requests by two ladies to borrow pencils to avoid answering the questionnaire with pens. All participants then began work. The time was 6:13 p.m. There were no questions or comments by any of the participants while answering the pretest.

The last person completed the questionnaire at 6:44 p.m., and each small group met with the appropriate group leader for the first small group session.

In the directions given above, the participants were instructed to copy the number appearing in the upper right hand corner of the first page of the questionnaire. The participants were told only that they would need this number later in the workshop. These numbers served a very important purpose. It was felt by this investigator that the participants would feel less inhibited and more at ease if they did not have to sign the questionnaires. It was in turn hoped that this precaution would produce, if only minutely, a more accurate estimate of the participants' knowledge of the workshop topics. In the directions to the posttest, the participants were instructed to place the same number they had for the first questionnaire (pretest) on this questionnaire (posttest). It was then a very simple matter to match the numbers when comparing the pretest with the posttest.

It might be noted that the word pretest was never mentioned in the oral comments made to the participants. Neither did the word appear in any place on the pretest itself. This same procedure was also followed with the posttest. Reasoning for this decision was based upon the fact that too many persons are terrified or become very nervous by the mere mention of the word "test." Therefore, it was decided to use the word questionnaire instead. It was hoped that those participants bothered by the word "test" would be more at ease and, thus, would function more efficiently in completing the questionnaire.

The participants, further, were not informed that they would answer another questionnaire (posttest) at the end of the workshop.

This information was not released at the beginning of the program because the purpose of the two instruments would have become instantly obvious to some participants.

Finally, the major reason for using the word questionnaire rather than pretest or posttest, for not revealing the fact that another questionnaire (posttest) would be completed by each participant at the end, and for not revealing to the participants that they were taking part in a field testing situation and were part of an experiment was the fear of contaminating the study. Such knowledge in itself is in many cases enough to cloud and discolor the findings of such a study.

After the four small group sessions were completed, it was time for all twenty-one participants to meet jointly for the concluding session. The time was 10:04 p.m. At this time, this investigator thanked the participants for their attendance and expressed the hope that each person had benefitted in some way from the workshop. The four resource persons were given a special vote of appreciation and a round of applause. The investigator then made the following announcement to the participants:

We would greatly appreciate it if you would take the next few minutes and fill out another questionnaire for us. We realize it is getting rather late, but the information provided by this questionnaire is extremely important to us. Once again, it is not necessary for you to sign your questionnaire, but it is very important for you to take the number that appeared on the first questionnaire and write it in the upper right hand corner of the first page of this one. Be sure to read the directions carefully before starting, and, once again, indicate whether you are a board member or a prospective board member by marking the correct blank in the middle of the first page. There is no time limit on this questionnaire either. Please work as quickly and carefully as you possibly can. Are there any questions? If there are no questions, I would like to thank you once again for coming this evening. Have a safe trip home. You may leave when you finish your questionnaire. If there are any questions while you are working, please raise your hand. You may begin.

No questions were asked after the directions were given or while the posttest was being taken. All participants immediately began work. The time was 10:10 p.m. The last participant completed the posttest at 10:42 p.m.

As the workshop participants were leaving, this investigator spoke to several of them in the hall. A number of persons made comments about the workshop. To the satisfaction of the investigator, only positive remarks were sounded. These statements were immediately recorded and appear in Appendix M.

The twenty-one pretest scores and twenty-one corresponding posttest scores registered by the workshop participants are listed in Table 39. Of the twenty-one participants, 18 or 85.7 percent increased their scores by at least one point from the pretest to the posttest. Another 2 or 9.5 percent of the twenty-one participants scored the same number of points on both the pretest and posttest. Lastly, 1 or 4.8 percent of the twenty-one participants scored lower on the posttest than on the pretest. This latter information dealing with the pretest and posttest scores is summarized in Table 40.

Table 40

Number and Percent of Changed Scores Between Pretest and Posttest

	Number	Percent
Participants scoring higher on posttest than on pretest	18	85.7
Participants scoring same on pretest and posttest	2	9.5
Participants scoring lower on posttest than on pretest	1	4.8

Table 39
Pretest Scores and Posttest Scores

Participant Number	Pretest Scores	Posttest Scores
1	81	86
2	98	101
3	92	92
4	59	68
5	84	87
6	68	72
7	93	98
8	86	92
9	52	55
10	79	79
11	102	107
12	94	96
13	71	74
14	83	90
15	63	61
16	88	93
17	85	88
18	95	101
19	82	85
20	90	91
21	78	83

Once all the data had been collected, a t-test was administered to compare the mean of the pretest scores with the mean of the posttest scores. It was decided to use the t-test for correlated samples or paired cases. This was done because, undoubtedly, the pretest and posttest were correlated because the same individuals responded to the items both before and after the treatment. Certainly not all personal traits reflected by the test were presumed to be altered by the treatment.

When the pretest scores and posttest scores were analyzed, it was found that the variance for the pretest was 172.650, the standard deviation for the pretest was 13.140, and the mean for the pretest was 82.048. The posttest variance was 180.435, the posttest standard deviation was 13.433, and the posttest mean was 85.667. This information can be found capsuled in Table 41.

Table 41

Variance, Standard Deviation, and Mean for Pretest and Posttest

	Pretest	Posttest
Variance	172.650	180.435
Standard deviation	13.140	13.433
Mean	82.048	85.667

When the t-test of correlated samples is used, N or the total number is equal to the number of paired cases. In this case, N was twenty-one. The degrees of freedom are calculated in the t-test for paired data by the formula $N-1$. Here, this was twenty-one minus one or twenty degrees of freedom. When all of the above data concerning

the pretest scores and posttest scores were analyzed, the t value for the correlated means proved to be -6.481 .

The next step was to determine the significance of the difference between the means for the pretest and posttest. This investigator chose the .05 level of significance for this purpose. Table III, "Distribution of T ," in Clinton I. Chase's Elementary Statistical Procedures was the table of t values consulted.¹ Entering this table with twenty degrees of freedom it was found that a t of 2.086 was needed for significance at the 5 percent level. Since the t value in the testing situation described above was -6.481 , it was concluded that the difference between the means was significant at the 5 percent level. It was also noted with interest that when the same table was entered with a t value of -6.481 and twenty degrees of freedom at the .01 level of significance, the difference between the means also proved to be significant at this level. A t of 2.845 was needed for significance at the 1 percent level. The above data and information are summarized in Table 42.

Table 42

The t -Test of Significance

N	df	t Value for Correlated Means	t Value Required for Significance at .05 Level	t Value Required for Significance at .01 Level
21	20	-6.481	2.086	2.845

$t = -6.481$ $p .05$ $p .01$ $df = 20$

¹Clinton I. Chase, Elementary Statistical Procedures (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967), p. 232.

One further piece of information concerning the field testing situation was uncovered. To obtain a more precise estimate of the direction and degree of relations between the sets of ordered pairs in the pretest and posttest, Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient was calculated for the pairs listed earlier. The result was a high positive relation of 0.982. Such a high positive relationship could be attributed to the fact that eighteen of the twenty-one workshop participants increased their scores from the pretest to the posttest. In other words, eighteen of the twenty-one members of the sets of ordered pairs covaried or varied together. Therefore, a high positive relationship resulted. This data on Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient can be found in Table 43.

The major purpose of the field testing situation described above and the statistical analysis that followed was to test the eighth question of the study. The eighth question asked: How effective is the preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members when tested under actual working conditions? Based upon the findings discussed in the latter part of this chapter, it was concluded that the training program for board members was highly effective in terms of the t-test performed in this particular testing situation.

Table 43

Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient

Pretest	Posttest
81	86
98	101
92	92
59	68
84	87
68	72
93	98
86	92
52	55
79	79
102	107
94	96
71	74
83	90
63	61
88	93
85	88
95	101
82	85
90	91
78	83

$$r = 0.982$$

Chapter 6

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE STUDY

The problem of the study was to develop a preservice training program for prospective board of education members. The program was also developed to be of use by board members already serving.

The final chapter of this study is divided into four sections. The first section contains a summary of the entire study. The second section presents the conclusions drawn from the study. The implications of the study are presented in section three, while section four concludes the chapter with the recommendations of the study.

SUMMARY

The problem of this study was to develop a preservice training program for prospective board of education members. The program was also developed so as to be of use by board members already serving. More specifically, the major objectives of the study were: (1) to determine if Tennessee and Tennessee's bordering states have preservice or inservice training programs for school board members; (2) to determine the qualifications for serving as a school board member in Tennessee and in Tennessee's bordering states; (3) to determine if some type of preservice training program should be required of all prospective school board members; (4) to determine the types of activities a school board member should be familiar with before assuming his job;

(5) to determine what a preservice and/or inservice training program for school board members should consist of and based on these needs to develop such a training program; and (6) to field test the preservice and/or inservice training program with a group of school board members and prospective school board members.

A review of literature was conducted in the areas pertaining to the problem of the study as well as to the questions. The information collected through this process was separated into major categories, and decisions were made as to which materials to include in the study.

Letters of inquiry were sent to the state school boards associations and the state departments of education in Tennessee and Tennessee's eight bordering states requesting information relevant to the study.

A survey of school board training practices in Tennessee's 146 school systems was conducted. A specific instrument (Appendix A) was developed to generate the data for this part of the study.

The culmination of the study was the development of a comprehensive preservice training program for prospective school board members. The program was also developed with the intention of serving as an inservice program for presently serving board members.

Once the school board training program was developed, it was field tested for effectiveness. The field testing situation involved a number of school board members and prospective school board members from the East Tennessee area.

Findings in the study supported the thesis that there was a need for a preservice and/or inservice training program for board of education members.

CONCLUSIONS

Based upon a review of literature of materials relevant to the problem area, it was concluded that there had been practically no research dealing directly with preservice training for school board members. A number of studies made mention of such programs and a few suggested the need for research in this area, but that was about all. Very little had been done in the inservice training area for school board members. This also became quite apparent after a review of the related literature. It should be added that in those few studies where a training program for school board members had been developed very little, if any, attempt had been made to field test or validate the program. This made it impossible to tell whether such a program was really effective and of any value.

On the basis of the Questionnaire sent to superintendents, board chairmen and selected board members, it was concluded that there was very little formal, organized training for school board members in the state of Tennessee. Of the 394 persons responding to the Questionnaire, 71.8 percent indicated that their school system had no orientation or training program for new school board members while another 19.8 percent said their school system had only an informal one.

At the same time, based upon the above mentioned Questionnaire it was concluded that superintendents, board chairmen, and selected board members desired and believed that there should be better training of board members in Tennessee. When the respondents to the Questionnaire were specifically asked if they felt that board members in their systems should receive better orientation or training for their jobs, 95.7 percent answered "yes." A number of the state

departments of education and state school boards associations contacted also voiced the opinion that board members in their respective states should have better training for their positions.

Based upon the information received as a result of the letters of inquiry sent to the state departments of education and state school boards associations in Tennessee's eight border states, it was concluded that these states varied widely in their efforts to train school board members for their jobs. Based upon the above information, few of these states had a strong, formal, organized training program that effectively reached all of the board members of the state. Certain states appeared to concentrate their efforts upon the more populous metropolitan areas of the state while board members in other parts of the state never came in contact with such programs.

The question of whether to require prospective board members to participate in some type of training program was of extreme importance to this study. Based upon the Questionnaire sent to superintendents, board chairmen, and selected board members, as well as the review of related literature, it was concluded that board members should not be required to take part in a training program either before or after election or appointment. When the respondents to the Questionnaire were asked if they felt some type of preservice orientation or training program should be required of all prospective school board members, better than three out of four persons answered "no." Rather, the conclusion reached was that such a program should be made available to both prospective board members and board members already serving and that these individuals should be encouraged to participate, but in the end, attendance should remain voluntary.

It was further concluded that there was a need for more board member training in the state of Tennessee. There was also some indication of such a need in Tennessee's eight border states. One possible answer to this need is a training program for school board members and prospective board members such as the one developed in this study.

It was concluded, based upon the board member workshop and statistical analysis that followed, that the preservice and/or inservice training program developed could help board members and prospective board members to become better versed and more learned in those areas and competencies needed to become an effective board member. This conclusion was especially supported by the results of the t-test performed on the difference between the means of the pretest and posttest administered at the workshop. The difference between the means was significant at both the 5 percent and 1 percent levels.

Finally, it was concluded by this investigator, based upon responses from superintendents, board chairmen, selected board members, state departments of education, and state school boards associations that those persons involved in the education process in Tennessee and in Tennessee's border states were interested in seeing the quality of school boardmanship upgraded. This conclusion was reached as a result of the high percentage of returns of the Questionnaire sent to superintendents, board chairmen, and selected board members as well as the great response of the state departments of education and state school boards associations in Tennessee and in Tennessee's eight border states to the letter of inquiry.

The Questionnaires were sent to the superintendent, board chairman, and one board member other than the chairman chosen at

random in each of the 146 school systems in Tennessee. This made a total of 438 Questionnaires sent. Of these 438, 394 or 90.0 percent were completed and returned which was excellent considering that a 70 percent return was established as acceptable. As for the responses to the letter of inquiry, every state school boards association and every state department of education involved in the study responded to the letter. The quality of the answers to the Questionnaire and to the letter of inquiry was further proof of the concern reflected by these persons for the quality of school boardmanship in their respective states.

IMPLICATIONS

A major implication of this study was that the states involved in the study needed to emphasize more emphatically the proper training of school board members in their respective states. As Tennessee was the focal point of the study and the major portion of the study concentrated on Tennessee, an especially strong argument could be made for increased emphasis on board member training in Tennessee in view of the findings of the study.

Another implication was the need for further study concerning the competencies needed for effective boardmanship and ways of instilling such competencies in school board members. One of the disclosures of this study was the small amount of work that has been done in this area. This particular study and the resulting preservice and/or inservice training program were ventures in this realm.

In view of the lack of board member training in many areas, more responsibility would be automatically placed upon the individual

board member to do what he could to improve himself and make himself a better public servant. This would require and request that a considerable amount of personal effort be put forth, but until conditions improve as far as board member training is concerned, such an effort is certainly needed.

Closely related to the above issue was the fact that local school systems, in view of the lack of proper training opportunities coming from the state level, need to do what they can at the local level in the way of board member training. It would be wise if a number of neighboring school systems cooperated on such an undertaking. At the local level, the superintendent of schools must play a key role if any such board member training program is to have any chance of succeeding.

A further implication was that the states must provide more help for board members in the way of training for their jobs because much dissatisfaction with the status quo was voiced by the respondents to the Questionnaire. At this time, the questions came to a point, not only to what was best for the schools but to what many educators and board members were demanding more and more every day--better training for school board members.

Based upon responses to the letters of inquiry, most of the state departments of education contacted were not interested in being directly responsible for school board member training. These departments did stress, however, that they would be willing to cooperate with the state school boards associations in such a task. Based upon the findings of the study, the state school boards association was the most logical choice for sponsoring board member training in a particular state.

The study pointed toward the need for state school boards associations to assume much greater responsibility for the adequate training of board of education members. This task must not be taken lightly because the welfare of the nation's children could be at stake. In relation to this matter, it was interesting to note that the Tennessee Department of Education had shown some interest in initiating some type of board member training program itself.

Since the field testing situation proved to be successful, in terms of the t-test performed, the obvious implication was to move forward with board member and prospective board member training without delay. Such training was shown through this study to be not only practical and feasible, but also highly informative.

Another implication of the study was that all persons interested in quality education must work together to improve the effectiveness of school board members. Hopefully, better schools and, therefore, higher quality education will be the result. A final implication that was pointed to at this time was that there was not nearly enough emphasis placed on board member training.

RECOMMENDATIONS

From these conclusions and implications, eight major recommendations can be made:

1. It is recommended that the Tennessee Department of Education and the Tennessee School Boards Association instigate a joint study on the feasibility of initiating a statewide school board member training program.
2. It is recommended that the preservice and/or inservice

training program for board of education members developed in this study be tried on a statewide basis for an extended period of time, possibly two or three years.

3. More research is recommended in the area of school board member training, both preservice and inservice.

4. Additional research is recommended to further define the competencies needed for effective school boardmanship and to uncover other ways and methods of instilling such competencies in school board members.

5. It is recommended that individual board members read, study, and do everything possible to make themselves better, more effective school board members.

6. It is recommended that local school systems further extend their training practices to prepare and orient the new and prospective school board members in their own systems. This expansion would include studying the feasibility and practicality of conducting their own school board member training program.

7. It is recommended that Tennessee and Tennessee's eight border states take immediate action to upgrade their individual school board member training programs or to initiate such programs if none presently exist.

8. It is recommended that the state school boards associations take the lead in initiating school board member training programs in Tennessee and in Tennessee's eight border states.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- American Association of School Administrators. Educational Administration in a Changing Community. Thirty-seventh Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1959.
- Arneson, A. L., L. H. Dominick, and John C. West. A Handbook for Boards of Education. Grand Forks, North Dakota: University of North Dakota Press, 1932.
- Ashby, Lloyd W. The Effective School Board Member. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1968.
- Bolmeir, Edward C. The School in the Legal Structure. Cincinnati: W. H. Anderson, 1968.
- Campbell, Roald F., Jacob W. Getzels, and James M. Lipham. Educational Administration as a Social Process. New York: Harper and Row, 1968.
- Campbell, Roald F., John E. Corbally, Jr., and John A. Ramseyer. Introduction to Educational Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969.
- Chase, Clinton I. Elementary Statistical Procedures. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.
- Complete Guide and Index to ERIC Reports. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Cooper, Alfred M. How to Conduct Conferences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1946.
- Crow, Alice, and Lester D. Crow. Introduction to Education. New York: American Book, 1966.
- Dale, Edgar, and Seth Spaulding, eds. How to Have a Successful Conference. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Educational Research, 1951.
- Davies, Daniel R., and Elwood Prestwood. School Board Procedures. New York: Chartwell House, 1951.
- Davies, Daniel R., and Fred W. Hosler. The Challenge of School Board Membership. New York: Chartwell House, 1951.
- Dissertation Abstracts International-Retrospective Index. Ann Arbor, Michigan: University of Michigan, 1970.

- Dykes, Archie R. School Board and Superintendent: Their Effective Working Relations. Danville, Illinois: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1965.
- Good, Carter V., ed. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Gove, Philip B., ed. Webster's Third New International Dictionary. Springfield, Massachusetts: G. and C. Merriam, 1967.
- Guralnik, David B., ed. Webster's New World Dictionary. New York: World Publishing, 1970.
- Hoffmann, Randall W., and Robert Plutchik. Small Group Discussion in Orientation and Teaching. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959.
- Johns, Roe L., and Edgar L. Morphet. The Economics and Financing of Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1969.
- Johns, Roe L., Edgar L. Morphet, and Theodore L. Reller. Educational Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1960.
- Kerlinger, Fred N. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.
- McCarty, Donald J., and Charles E. Ramsey. The School Managers. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Publishing, 1971.
- McGhehey, Marion A. Toward More Effective Boards of Education, ed. Harlan D. Beem. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Newlon, Jesse H. Educational Administration as Social Policy. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1934.
- Nolte, M. Chester. An Introduction to School Administration. London: Macmillan, 1970.
- Philipson, Richard L., and Roger C. Seager, eds. School Boards and School Board Problems, a Clinical Approach. Milwaukee: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.
- Pratt, Wayne L., and Irving W. Stout. Navajo School Board Training Project. Window Rock, Arizona: Bureau of Indian Affairs, 1972.
- Reeder, Ward G. School Boards and Superintendents. New York: Macmillan, 1954.
- Reeves, Charles E. School Boards: Their Status, Functions, and Activities. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954.
- School Research Information Service. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Research Service Center, 1972.

Tuttle, Edward M. School Board Leadership in America. Chicago: Interstate Printers and Publishers, 1958.

B. PERIODICALS

Coleman, Bob. "Survey of Tennessee School Boards," Tennessee School Boards Journal, 24:5-7, March, 1973.

Gross, Neal. "Easing Strains and Tensions Between Superintendents and Board Members," The Nation's Schools, October 1955, p. 47.

"How About a Couple of Hundred Ways to Be a Better Boardman or Administrator," The American School Board Journal, 159:39, February, 1972.

Piper, Donald L. "Help for Beleaguered Board Members," School Management, May 1972, pp. 20-21.

Ruys, Marie S. "Could You Be a Better Board Member Than You Are?" The American School Board Journal, 160:38, August, 1973,

C. UNPUBLISHED WORKS

Andrews, James R. "A Study of the Perceptions Held by New School Board Members Toward Their Training for Board Membership." Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1971.

Carter, Leslie G. "State School Boards Associations in Twelve Selected States." Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1954.

Conley, Billy L. "A Study of Boards of Education in the Southern Region." Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1962.

Drayer, John M. "A Descriptive Study of the Inservice Education Programs of the Wyoming School Boards Association." Doctoral dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1970.

Kammer, Benjamin A. "Effective School Board Behavior as It Relates to School Board Inservice Activities in the State of Colorado." Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1968.

Lacey, James D. "An Analysis of the Respective Duties and Functions of Selected Florida Superintendents and School Boards." Doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1962.

Lautenschlager, Harley M. "A Study of School Board Inservice Training Techniques." Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1956.

O'brien, Lorraine. "Inservice Education for Board of Education Personnel: Special Reference to New York City." Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1958.

- Porterfield, James C. "Attitudes and Opinions of School Board Members in Nebraska Concerning the Duties and Responsibilities of Boards of Education." Doctoral dissertation, University of Nebraska Teachers College, 1957.
- Rich, William B. "The Tennessee School Boards Association." Doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1956.
- Rohrbaugh, James L. "A Study of Effective School Board Membership in Indiana." Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1967.
- Sales, Frederick C. "A Survey of the Orientation of New School Board Members by Selected Local School Districts." Doctoral dissertation, Temple University, 1970.
- Shannon, Avon G. "What Public School Board Members in the United States Want to Know About Their Schools: With Special Reference to Arkansas." Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1959.
- Weitman, Ronald E. "An Analytical Study of the Inservice Educational Needs of the Chairmen of Boards of Education in Georgia." Doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, 1960.
- White, Alpheus L. "A Summary and Analysis of Significant Research Findings on Selected School Board Problems." Doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1959.
- Wyss, Donald F. "Certain Characteristics and Activities of School Board Members in Missouri." Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri, 1960.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

**COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE TO SUPERINTENDENTS,
BOARD CHAIRMEN, AND SELECTED BOARD MEMBERS**

Route 1
Greenwood Manor, Apt. 6
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601
March 21, 1974

Dear Friends:

I am now engaged in a research project which will culminate in a training program for school board members. Max Harrison, a member of the Tennessee Department of Education stationed at East Tennessee State University, will be working with me in field testing the program once it is developed.

Enclosed is a Questionnaire which I would appreciate your filling out and returning at your earliest convenience in the enclosed, self-addressed envelope. The development of the training program relies heavily on the information collected by means of this Questionnaire. There is no need to sign the form, and no attempt will be made to identify the person or school system from which the Questionnaire came. This information is not needed for the study. Only the answers to the Questionnaire are important. The success of this project relies heavily on your cooperation in this matter.

Yours truly,

Charles E. Calloway

Enclosure

QUESTIONNAIRE TO SUPERINTENDENTS, BOARD CHAIRMEN,
AND SELECTED BOARD MEMBERS

1. Do you feel board members in your school system should receive better orientation for their jobs?
☐ Yes
☐ No
☐ Not sure
2. Where do you feel a board member orientation program should be held?
☐ A university
☐ A public school
☐ Central office
☐ Other (please specify)
3. By whom do you feel the board member orientation program should be conducted?
☐ Superintendent
☐ Board Chairman
☐ Both Superintendent and Board Chairman
☐ State School Boards Association
☐ National School Boards Association
☐ State Department of Education
☐ Other (please specify)
4. What type of speakers should be used in a board member orientation program?
☐ Lay
☐ Professional
☐ Both lay and professional
5. When do you feel the board member orientation program should be offered?
☐ Before election or appointment
☐ Just before taking office
☐ Just after taking office
☐ Other (please specify)
6. How long should the board member orientation program last?
☐ A few hours
☐ A day
☐ A week
☐ A month
☐ Other (please specify)
7. Number the following areas in order of importance as far as consideration for a board member orientation program is concerned.

- (Number 1 is most important)
- ☐ Public or human relations
 - ☐ Curriculum and instruction
 - ☐ School finance
 - ☐ School law
 - ☐ Policies of the school system
 - ☐ School buildings and equipment
 - ☐ Interest groups
 - ☐ Other (please specify and number)
8. Does your school system have orientation programs for new school board members?
- ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ An informal one
9. Is your school system's orientation program for school board members considered comprehensive or less than that?
- ☐ Comprehensive
 - ☐ Adequate
 - ☐ Minimum
 - ☐ Insufficient
 - ☐ None
10. Indicate the items that are used in your orientation program for new board members (if your school system has such a program).
- A. Reading materials:
- ☐ School regulations
 - ☐ School board policy guide
 - ☐ Minutes of board meetings
 - ☐ Literature from school boards association
 - ☐ Commercial sources
 - ☐ Board reports, curriculum and budgetary materials
 - ☐ State codes
 - ☐ Seminars
 - ☐ Group sessions
 - ☐ Other (please specify)
- B. A private conference in which problems and issues are covered:
- ☐ With the superintendent
 - ☐ With the board chairman
 - ☐ With both the superintendent and the board chairman
 - ☐ With a staff member below the rank of superintendent
 - ☐ With a board member other than the board chairman
 - ☐ Other (please specify)
- C. Visits to the school system's offices and schools:
- ☐ With the superintendent
 - ☐ With the board chairman
 - ☐ With other board members, a principal or a central staff employee
 - ☐ Other (please specify)

D. A letter of welcome and congratulations:

- ☐ From the superintendent
- ☐ From the board chairman
- ☐ Other (please specify)

E. Other categories (please list)

11. When does the new board member receive his orientation (if your school system has such a program)?
 - ☐ Before taking office
 - ☐ After taking office
 - ☐ Before and after taking office
12. Who carries out the orientation of the new board member (if your school system has an orientation program)?
 - ☐ Both the board chairman and superintendent
 - ☐ The superintendent
 - ☐ The board chairman
 - ☐ Board secretary
 - ☐ County and state staff
 - ☐ Other board members
 - ☐ A principal
 - ☐ Other (please specify)
13. Do you feel that some type of preservice orientation program should be required of all prospective school board members?
 - ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No
14. If you were orienting a new board member, what things would you emphasize to him as being most important? (Please list and circle whether you are a superintendent, a board chairman, or a regular board member. If additional room is needed, please use back of sheet.)

APPENDIX B

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO QUESTIONNAIRE

Route 1
Greenwood Manor, Apt. 6
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601
April 30, 1974

Dear Friends:

A few weeks ago you received a Questionnaire concerning school board orientation programs. This is just a reminder in case you have not completed and returned your Questionnaire. I realize how busy you must be, but I would greatly appreciate it if you would fill your Questionnaire out and return it to me if you have not already done so at this time. Just in case you might have misplaced yours, I have enclosed another copy. The success of the research project I am now engaged in and the development of the orientation program for school board members cannot possibly succeed without your help in this matter. Thank you.

Yours truly,

Charles E. Calloway

Enclosure

APPENDIX C

**LETTER OF INQUIRY TO STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION AND
STATE SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION**

Route 1
Greenwood Manor, Apt. 6
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601
February 21, 1974

Dear Friends:

I am a doctoral student at East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee. I am now involved in research for my dissertation which concerns school board member training programs. I am in great need of information about your state in three particular areas. The first area has to do with the qualifications for becoming a board member in your state. The major interest here is whether or not your state requires prospective or new board members to participate in any type of training program either before or after being elected to their positions. Secondly, any information concerning preservice or inservice training programs for school board members as they now exist in your state will be appreciated. Lastly, any information or suggestions as to what things should be included in a preservice or inservice training program for school board members will be of much help. The success of this project greatly depends on your help. Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours truly,

Charles E. Calloway

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO LETTER OF INQUIRY

Route 1
Greenwood Manor, Apt. 6
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601
April 2, 1974

Dear Friends:

A few weeks ago I requested information from you in three particular areas. This information is urgently needed and I would greatly appreciate your help in this matter. The first area has to do with the qualifications for becoming a board member in your state. The major interest here is whether or not your state requires prospective or new board members to participate in any type of training program either before or after being elected to their positions. Secondly, any information concerning preservice or inservice training programs for school board members as they now exist in your state will be appreciated. Lastly, any information or suggestions as to what things should be included in a preservice or inservice training program for school board members will be of much help. The research project I am now engaged in cannot succeed without your help. Your cooperation will be sincerely appreciated. Thank you.

Yours truly,

Charles E. Calloway

APPENDIX E

LETTER OF INVITATION TO WORKSHOP

Route 1
Greenwood Manor, Apt. 6
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601
June 6, 1974

Dear Friends:

On Thursday, June 27, 1974, there will be a workshop for school board members offered on the campus of East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee. The workshop will begin at 6:00 p.m. and will be held in room 411 of the Education Building. The topics to be discussed are "The School Board Member and School Finance," "The School Board Member and School Law," "The School Board Member and Board Policy," and "The School Board Member and Buildings and Equipment."

There will be no charge for the workshop and refreshments will be served. The program will end approximately 10:30 p.m. You are cordially invited to attend this workshop and we sincerely hope you will be able to join us.

Yours truly,

Charles E. Calloway

APPENDIX F

NOTICE TO SUPERINTENDENTS EXPLAINING WORKSHOP

Route 1
Greenwood Manor, Apt. 6
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601
June 6, 1974

Dear Friends:

On Thursday, June 27, 1974, a workshop for school board members and prospective board members will be conducted on the campus of East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee. The workshop will begin at 6:00 p.m. and will be held in room 411 of the Education Building. The topics to be discussed are "The School Board Member and School Finance," "The School Board Member and School Law," "The School Board Member and Board Policy, and "The School Board Member and Buildings and Equipment."

There will be no charge for the workshop and refreshments will be served. The program will end approximately 10:30 p.m. We would greatly appreciate it if you would invite the board members in your system, as well as any prospective board members, to attend this workshop. Thank you.

Yours truly,

Charles E. Calloway

APPENDIX G

LETTER TO RADIO AND TELEVISION STATIONS

Route 1
Greenwood Manor, Apt. 6
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601
June 12, 1974

Dear Sirs:

I would appreciate your assistance in airing the following public service announcement at your earliest convenience and in keeping with your station's policies covering the number of days allotted to such an announcement:

A workshop for school board members and prospective board members will be held on Thursday evening, June 27, at 6 p.m. The workshop will be held in Room 411 of the Education Building on the East Tennessee State University campus. Co-sponsored by Max Harrison, Tennessee Department of Education, and Charles E. Calloway, doctoral student at ETSU, the workshop will feature a program of topics including: "The Board Member and School Law," "The Board Member and School Finance," "The Board Member and Board Policy," and "The Board Member and Buildings and Equipment." There is no charge for the workshop and refreshments will be served. For further information call 929-2713

Should you need to discuss this announcement, please call me at 929-2713. I appreciate your assistance in this matter. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Calloway

APPENDIX H

LETTER TO NEWSPAPERS

Route 1
Greenwood Manor, Apt. 6
Johnson City, Tennessee 37601
June 12, 1974

Dear Sirs:

I would appreciate your assistance in publishing the following public service announcement at your earliest convenience and in keeping with your paper's policies covering the number of days allotted to such an announcement:

SCHOOL BOARD WORKSHOP
Co-sponsored by Max Harrison, Tennessee Department of
Education, and Charles E. Calloway, doctoral student at ETSU
All school board members and prospective
board members are invited
Thursday, June 27, 1974
Education Building, East Tennessee State University
Room 411
6 P.M.
Seminars in
"The Board Member and School Law"
"The Board Member and School Finance"
"The Board Member and School Policy"
"The Board Member and Buildings and Equipment"
No Charge Refreshments Served
Call 929-2713 for further information

Should you need to discuss this announcement, please call me at 929-2713. If there is any charge for publishing the announcement, please bill me at the above address. I appreciate your assistance in this matter. Thank you,

Sincerely,

Charles E. Calloway

APPENDIX I

**WORKSHOP ANNOUNCEMENTS PLACED
IN EDUCATION BUILDING**

-- WORKSHOP --

A Workshop for ---- school board members
 ---- prospective school board members

Will be held on ---- Thursday, June 27th

at 6:00 p.m. in ---- Education Building - Room 411 ---- ETSU

Topics to be discussed: "The School Board Member and School Finance"
 "The School Board Member and School Law"
 "The School Board Member and Board Policy"
 "The School Board Member and Buildings and Equipment"

NO CHARGE - - - - - REFRESHMENTS

-- ALL ARE INVITED --

APPENDIX J

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE

WORKSHOP SCHEDULE					
6:00 - 6:45 Introduction Room 411	6:45 - 7:30	7:30 - 8:15	8:15 - 8:30	8:30 - 9:15	9:15 - 10:00
Dr. Clinton Moody Room 411 "The School Board Member and School Law"	Group 1	Group 2	Break (Room 418)	Group 3	Group 4
Mr. Jim Counts Room 413 "The School Board Member and School Finance"	Group 2	Group 3	Break (Room 418)	Group 4	Group 1
Mr. Max Harrison Room 413 "The School Board Member and Board Policy"	Group 3	Group 4	Break (Room 418)	Group 1	Group 2
Mr. Mack Pierce Room 419 "The School Board Member and Buildings and Equipment"	Group 4	Group 1	Break (Room 418)	Group 2	Group 3
10:00 - 10:30 Conclusion Room 411					

APPENDIX K

PRETEST

W O R K S H O P

For School Board Members
and
Prospective Board Members

Thursday, June 27, 1974
6:00 P.M.
Room 411 - Education Building
East Tennessee State University

The following questionnaire is to be answered by all workshop participants. Participants are instructed to answer the questions as quickly and carefully as possible. Please remember that the four major areas of interest for the workshop and for the questionnaire are "The Board Member and School Finance," "The Board Member and School Law," "The Board Member and Board Policy," and "The Board Member and Buildings and Equipment." (*Correct answers provided)

_____ I am a board member.

_____ I am a prospective board member.

Use the words and phrases listed below to complete the following sentences. Place the correct word or phrase in each blank. Each word or phrase may be used more than once. Some may not be used at all.

whole	parents	majority
state	constituents	earmarked
tenure	policy	General Welfare
school building	property	school district
ability	minority	individual
sales	Supreme	certificate
faith	income	policies

1. Parents have a right to determine the kind of schools their children attend.
2. Each citizen in the state should contribute, in accordance with his ability, to the support of public schools and public institutions of higher learning.
3. Property taxes have been the chief source of school support.
4. The property tax is the most regressive of any of the major taxes.
5. A tax is said to be earmarked when the proceeds are dedicated to a particular function and the yield of the tax determines the amount of the appropriation for that function.
6. Both the school district and state provided the funds needed to support the foundation program.
7. The General Welfare Clause of the Federal Constitution is the basis for much of the Federal Government's involvement in public education.
8. The school district is a territorial subdivision of the state in which the state function of education is performed.
9. In order for an action to be binding, it must be taken by the school board as a whole.
10. School board members are not likely to be held liable providing their actions are in good faith and without fraud.
11. Unless an express statute provides otherwise, the common-law rule is that a majority of the authorized membership of a board constitutes a quorum.
12. In the absence of a quorum, any action taken is that of the individual members present and does not legally bind the district.
13. The Supreme Court has great authority and responsibility in formulating educational policy.
14. A school building is any building designed to carry out a part of the instructional program authorized by the district.
15. Before one can enter into a valid contract to teach in the public schools, he must possess a certificate of qualifications as is required by law.
16. A tenure right is construed to mean the right of employment for a continuing or indefinite period of time, subject to removal only for a cause prescribed by state law.

17. The establishment of policy constitutes the legislative activity of the board of education.
18. Policies must underlie practices and procedures.
19. Once a new building is completed, it is the duty of the board to accept the building on behalf of their constituents.

Place a capital "T" in the blanks beside those statements that are true and a capital "F" in the blanks beside those statements that are false.

- T 1. Education is an investment in people.
- F 2. Equality of educational opportunity means that every child should receive the same program of education.
- T 3. Educational discrimination based on place of residence and social or economic status is practiced and condoned in many parts of this country.
- F 4. Every citizen in this country contributes his fair share to the support of public schools.
- F 5. The quality of education provided in the school systems where expenditures are low is no different than that in systems where expenditures are above the national average.
- T 6. Education should not be nor can be isolated from the social and political processes in this country.
- T 7. Education is vital to the economy of any given nation.
- T 8. Ability to pay is perhaps the most commonly accepted principle of taxation.
- F 9. The Federal personal income tax is an example of a regressive tax.
- T 10. State funds that may be used for general school purposes without any restriction, or for current expense, are called general-purpose funds.
- T 11. State funds that may be used only for specifically designated purposes, such as transportation or vocational education, are referred to as special-purpose funds.
- F 12. Federal agencies should deal directly with local school districts.
- T 13. The trend of court rulings has been to gradually increase the liability of boards of education.

- F 14. Fringe benefits should be considered as an extra cost to the board.
- F 15. Insurance purchased by a board for a school system need not be obtained through competitive bidding.
- T 16. The school board is an agency, composed of citizens, representing the territorial subdivision of the state called the school district in performing essentially the state function of education.
- F 17. Concerning the removal of school board members, in most states the superintendent conducts the procedure whereby school board members are removed from office.
- T 18. Virtually all states have constitutional and statutory provisions prohibiting "double-office holding" (incompatible offices).
- T 19. It is not necessary that all the members of a school board be present at a meeting in order to make the meeting legal.
- F 20. In voting, the entire quorum must agree before any action is legal.
- T 21. When a member of a school board sits silently by when given an opportunity to vote, he is regarded as assenting to, rather than opposing, the measure, and is regarded in law as voting with the majority.
- F 22. Unless statutes provide otherwise it is a general rule that minutes of board meetings are confidential records and thus are not open to inspection by the public.
- T 23. The record of the minutes is the best evidence of the board's action.
- T 24. School money is state money.
- T 25. A school board member is, in the eyes of the law, a public official.
- F 26. Boards can legally prohibit teachers from joining a union.
- T 27. Generally a child has the right, or at least the privilege, to attend a public school.
- T 28. A school board may not legally compel attendance of married students.
- T 29. A policy is a general statement which describes the objective to be achieved.

- F 30. Policies grow out of rules and regulations.
- F 31. Policies are very specific in nature and stipulate exactly how objectives are to be accomplished.
- T 32. Specific directions on school operations, such as how, by whom, where, and when, are rules and regulations.
- T 33. Most authorities agree that written statements of policy are essential to effective school administration.
- T 34. Policies help promote more consistent and prudent decision making.
- T 35. Policies provide continuity of action.
- F 36. Policies are costly to the board in time, money, and effort.
- F 37. Policies have no bearing on public relations.
- F 38. There is one best way of developing a set of written policy statements for all school districts.
- F 39. The board, and the board alone, should formulate policy.
- T 40. Examination of how policy has worked in practice permits the board to exercise its judicial function.
- F 41. The superintendent is the chief policy-maker for a school district.
- T 42. Today teachers are requesting, or even demanding, the right to play a stronger role in the formulation of educational policy.
- T 43. Careful planning should precede policy formation.
- T 44. Policies are the means by which the board operates.
- F 45. Since school systems very seldom change, there is no reason for board policies to change.
- F 46. Board members must decide what is to be built, where it is to be built, and how it is to be built, but it is not their problem to consider beauty in all these determinations.
- F 47. The responsibility for the functioning of school facilities ultimately rests with the building principal.
- F 48. The superintendent employs the architect.
- T 49. The board awards contracts to successful bidders.
- F 50. The board should carry out all planning for a new building by itself.

- T 51. Board members should never, under any circumstances, put themselves in the position of having to listen to the representatives of bidders by giving each an allocation of time in which to make a sales pitch.
- T 52. Concerning the equipment and furnishings for a new building, the board should base their decisions on recommendations of persons in whom they have confidence who have had time for thorough study of the products, the specifications, and the bids.
- T 53. Concerning the financial planning of a building, the board should establish policies and take actions based on the recommendations of the superintendent.
- F 54. If school money is invested, the superintendent should be the one to take care of it.
- T 55. Sometimes it might be better to modernize an old structure than to build a new building.
- F 56. It is not the responsibility of the board to assure that all legal requirements are met in connection with school plant development.
- T 57. Concerning the actual construction of a building, the board authorizes payment to or withholding of monies from contractors.
- F 58. It is the job of the architect to insist that contractors complete their work.
- T 59. Once a new building is ready for occupancy, the board should direct certain staff members to evaluate the building and have contractors remedy building deficiencies.
- F 60. Once the building is completed, the board's responsibility comes to an end.
- F 61. The board should let the superintendent handle the location of possible building sites and the evaluation of them.
- T 62. Under certain conditions, the board can condemn property needed for school use.
- F 63. It is not a good idea for board members to serve on survey teams when surveying school plant needs.

Underline the word or phrase in parenthesis that makes each of the following statements correct.

1. Education is a function of the (local school district, federal government, state).

2. The quality of education provided by the schools is generally (inferior, superior) to a few generations ago.
3. Education (decreases, increases, has no effect on) living standards.
4. The property tax is a (progressive, regressive, proportional) tax.
5. A progressive tax is a tax whereby the tax rate (decreases, increases, remains constant) as the income or property base increases.
6. A proportional tax is a tax whereby the tax rate (decreases, increases, remains constant) whether the base increases or decreases.
7. A regressive tax is a tax whereby the tax rate (decreases, increases, remains constant) as the base increases.
8. The foundation program has the characteristics of a (minimum, maximum) program in most states.
9. A board of education is said to be fiscally (independent, dependent) if it depends wholly or in part upon some other agency of local government for its revenues or for approval of its budget.
10. The (flat-grant, equalization) method of state funding involves calculation of the cost of a defined program, calculation of the amount of funds that can be raised by a prescribed uniform local effort, and payment by the state of the part of the cost of the program that can not be met from the prescribed local effort.
11. The (flat-grant, equalization) method of state funding is the distribution of funds on a uniform basis with no allowance for differences in tax-paying ability.
12. The (board, superintendent, faculty) should be responsible for the preparation of the annual budget.
13. Board members, as individuals, possess (no, great) authority over the schools.
14. The Constitution of the United States is conspicuous by its (many, omission of any) direct provisions or specific references concerning education.
15. A (misdemeanor, tort, felony) is a civil wrong, other than a breach of contract, for which the court will provide a remedy in the form of an action for damages.
16. Schools are state institutions and school property is (local district, state) property.

17. Local boards of education (may, may not) prescribe teacher qualifications beyond the minimum state requirements.
18. The power of the board to dismiss a teacher for just cause (is, is not) absolute.
19. The burden of proof rests upon the (teacher, school board) where possible incompetency is involved.
20. (Expulsion, Suspension) is generally an act of a professional member of the school staff.
21. (Expulsion, Suspension) is a prerogative of the school board.
22. Policy statements should encompass (most, all) aspects of school operation which command the attention of the school board.
23. Policies (should, should not) be flexible.
24. The superintendent is the chief (executive, legislative, judicial) officer of the board of education.
25. Board policies (should, should not) be a matter of public record.
26. The board of education itself (should, need not) be covered by policy.
27. It is the (superintendent's, architect's, board's) job to designate the time, place, and person to receive bids for construction.
28. Concerning the equipping and furnishing of a building, the (board, superintendent, architect) should decide who is to be involved and the parts they are to play.
29. Concerning the school system's building program, the (state, superintendent, board) should establish priorities of projects and reconcile needs and resources.
30. Whatever consultants are retained for the construction of a new building must be retained and paid by the (board, superintendent, architect).
31. It is the responsibility of the (board, architect, contractor) to carry Builder's Risk insurance when a new facility is being constructed.

APPENDIX L

POSTTEST

W O R K S H O P

For School Board Members
and
Prospective Board Members

Thursday, June 27, 1974
6:00 P.M.
Room 411 - Education Building
East Tennessee State University

The following questionnaire is to be answered by all workshop participants. Participants are instructed to answer the questions as quickly and carefully as possible. Please remember that the four major areas of interest for the workshop and for the questionnaire are "The Board Member and School Finance," "The Board Member and School Law," "The Board Member and Board Policy," and "The Board Member and Buildings and Equipment." (*Correct answers provided)

_____ I am a board member.

_____ I am a prospective board member.

Use the words and phrases listed below to complete the following sentences. Place the correct word or phrase in each blank. Each word or phrase may be used more than once. Some may not be used at all.

legislature	state	superintendent
bidding	education	county court
money	minutes	written
pay	school board	policy
right	policies	quorum
legally	Federal	

1. Education is an investment in people.
2. Education is a function of the state.
3. Education is vital to the economy of any given nation.
4. Ability to pay is perhaps the most commonly accepted principle of taxation.
5. The General Welfare Clause of the Federal Constitution is the basis for much of the Federal Government's involvement in public education.
6. The school board should be responsible for the preparation of the annual budget.
7. Insurance purchased by a board for a school system should be obtained through competitive bidding.
8. The school board is an agency, composed of citizens, representing the territorial subdivision of the state called the school district in performing essentially the state function of education.
9. Unless an express statute provides otherwise, the common-law rule is that a majority of the authorized membership of a board constitutes a quorum.
10. In the absence of a quorum, any action taken is that of the individual members present and does not legally bind the district.
11. The record of the minutes is the best evidence of the board's action.
12. Generally a child has the right, or at least the privilege, to attend a public school.
13. Most authorities agree that written statements of policy are essential to effective school administration.
14. Careful planning should precede policy formation.
15. Policies are means by which the board operates.

Place a capital "T" in the blanks beside those statements that are true and a capital "F" in the blanks beside those statements that are false.

- T 1. Parents have a right to determine the kind of schools their children attend.
- T 2. Each citizen in the state should contribute, in accordance with his ability, to the support of public schools and public institutions of higher learning.

- T 3. Equality of educational opportunity means that there must be opportunity for each to develop in accordance with his needs, to the maximum of his potential.
- F 4. Educational discrimination based on place of residence and social or economic status is nonexistent in this country.
- T 5. Many citizens do not contribute their fair share to the support of public schools not because they attempt to avoid their proper responsibility, but because the laws provide for or permit inequities.
- T 6. The quality of education provided by the school is generally superior to that of a few generations ago.
- F 7. Education has no effect on living standards.
- F 8. Education must be isolated from the political processes in this country.
- F 9. The property tax is a progressive tax.
- F 10. The foundation program has the characteristics of a maximum program in most states.
- F 11. The state provides all the funds needed to support the foundation program.
- F 12. A board of education is never liable for its actions.
- T 13. Fringe benefits should not be considered as an extra cost to the board, but as part of the salary paid.
- T 14. The school district is a territorial subdivision of the state in which the state function of education is performed.
- F 15. Board members, as individuals, possess a great deal of authority over the schools.
- F 16. In order for board action to be binding, it need not be taken by the school board as a whole.
- F 17. Very few states have constitutional or statutory provisions prohibiting "double-office holding" (incompatible offices).
- T 18. School board members are not likely to be held liable providing their actions are in good faith and without fraud.
- T 19. It is a well-established legal principle that a meeting is not legal unless a quorum is present.
- T 20. In voting, the majority of the quorum controls.
- F 21. When a member of a school board sits silently by when given an

opportunity to vote, in the eyes of the law he is regarded as voting neither for nor against the measure.

- T 22. Unless statutes provide otherwise, it is a general rule that minutes of board meetings are public documents or writings and thus are open to inspection by the public.
- T 23. The Constitution of the United States is conspicuous by its omission of any direct provisions or specific references concerning education.
- F 24. The Supreme Court has very little authority or responsibility in formulating educational policy.
- T 25. Schools are state institutions and therefore school property is state property.
- T 26. A school board member is definitely considered a school official and not a school employee.
- F 27. In some cases, one can enter into a valid contract to teach in public schools without possessing a certificate of qualifications.
- F 28. Local boards of education are required by law to adhere exactly to the minimum state requirements for teacher qualifications.
- T 29. The burden of proof rests upon the school board in providing incompetency, because the teacher's certificate is prima facie evidence of competency.
- T 30. Rules and regulations grow out of policies.
- T 31. A policy does not stipulate how objectives are to be accomplished; it points in the general direction.
- T 32. Policies minimize embarrassing inconsistencies in school-board action.
- F 33. Policies make continuity of action impossible.
- T 34. Policies can save the board time, money, and effort.
- T 35. Policies help improve public relations.
- F 36. Policy statements should encompass only a selected few of the more important aspects of school operations dealt with by the board.
- F 37. Policies should not be flexible.
- T 38. All those who are affected by a policy should have a hand in its formulation.

- F 39. Today teachers are satisfied to play practically no role in the formulation of educational policy.
- T 40. Policy must underlie practices and procedures.
- T 41. If board policies are a matter of public record, there should be no surprises on behalf of the board to upset the community.
- F 42. The board of education itself need not be covered by policy.
- T 43. As time passes, school systems change and board policies must change with them.
- T 44. Board members must decide what is to be built, where it is to be built, and how it is to be built, and they must allow beauty to be a consideration in all these determinations.
- T 45. The board should designate the time, place, and person to receive bids for construction.
- T 46. The board should select lay and pupil participants to take part in the planning for a new building.
- T 47. Concerning the equipping and furnishing of a building, the board should decide who is to be involved and the parts they are to play.
- F 48. Board members should always make it a point to listen to the representatives of bidders by giving each an allocation of time in which to make a sales pitch.
- F 49. Concerning the equipment and furnishings for a new building, the board should base their decisions on their own personal feelings and not on the recommendations of others.
- F 50. Concerning the school system's building program, the superintendent should establish priorities of projects and reconcile needs and resources.
- T 51. If investments are made with school money, they must result from formal action of the board.
- T 52. Whatever consultants are retained for the construction of a new building must be retained and paid by the board.
- T 53. The board members should hear the recommendations of educators, architects, and engineers and then make the ultimate decision on whether to modernize.
- T 54. Once a new building is completed, it is the duty of the board to accept the building on behalf of their constituents.
- F 55. The board does not have the power to withhold monies from contractors.

- T 56. It is the responsibility of the board to carry Builder's Risk insurance when a new facility is being constructed.
- F 57. Once a new building is ready for occupancy, there is nothing the board can do about any building deficiencies.
- T 58. Once the building is completed, the board must help the students, the staff, and the public accept the new facility and put it to use.
- T 59. The board should help to locate possible building sites and assist in evaluating them.
- F 60. There is never a case where a board can condemn property needed for school use.
- T 61. In surveying school plant needs, some board members may wish to serve on a survey team, and probably should.

Underline the word or phrase in parenthesis that makes each of the following statements correct.

1. The chief source of school support has been the (income, property, sales) tax.
2. The quality of education provided in the school systems where expenditures are low is (less satisfactory, more satisfactory, no different) than that in systems where expenditures are above the national average.
3. The personal income tax is an example of a (progressive, proportional, regressive) tax.
4. The property tax is the most (progressive, regressive) of any of the major taxes.
5. A board of education is said to be fiscally (independent, dependent) when no local government controls its revenue or budget.
6. Federal agencies (should, should not) deal directly with local school districts.
7. Concerning the removal of school board members, in most states the (superintendent, board, electorate) conducts the procedure whereby school board members are removed from office.
8. School money is (state, local district) money.
9. The power of the board to dismiss a teacher for just cause is absolute and (may, may not) be limited by contract.
10. Teachers (do, do not) have the right to join a union.

11. A school board (may, may not) legally compel attendance of married students.
12. Specific directions on school operations, such as how, by whom, where, and when, are (rules and regulations, policies).
13. There (is, is no) one best way of developing a set of written policy statements for all school districts.
14. The establishment of policy constitutes the (executive, legislative, judicial) activity of the board of education.
15. Examination of how policy has worked in practice permits the board to exercise its (executive, legislative, judicial) function.
16. The (board, chairman, superintendent) is the chief executive officer of the board of education.
17. The (public, superintendent, board) is the chief policy-maker for a school district.
18. The responsibility for the functioning of school facilities ultimately rests with the (superintendent, board, building principal).
19. The (board, superintendent, state) employs the architect.
20. The (architect, board, superintendent) awards contracts to the successful bidders.
21. Concerning the financial planning of a building, the board should establish policies and take actions based on the recommendations of the (superintendent, architect, state).
22. It is the responsibility of the (architect, superintendent, board) to assure that all legal requirements are met in connection with school plant development.
23. It is the (superintendent's, board's, architect's) duty to insist that contractors complete their work.

Place the letter of the word or phrase in the second column in the blank beside the number of the word or phrase in the first column to which it matches.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| <u>N</u> 1. progressive tax | A. a general statement which describes the objective to be achieved. |
| <u>F</u> 2. flat-grant | B. a prerogative of the school board. |
| <u>H</u> 3. special-purpose funds | C. the right of employment for a continuing or indefinite period of time, subject to removal only for a cause prescribed by state law. |
| <u>B</u> 4. expulsion | D. any building designed to carry out a part of the instructional program authorized by the district. |
| <u>K</u> 5. proportional tax | E. a civil wrong, other than a breach of contract, for which the court will provide a remedy in the form of an action for damages. |
| <u>C</u> 6. tenure right | F. the method of state funding where the funds are distributed on a uniform basis with no allowance for differences in taxpaying ability. |
| <u>L</u> 7. general-purpose funds | G. what a tax is said to be when the proceeds are dedicated to a particular function and the yield of the tax determines the amount of the appropriation for that function. |
| <u>M</u> 8. suspension | H. state funds that may be used only for specifically designated purposes, such as transportation or vocational education. |
| <u>E</u> 9. tort | I. a tax whereby the tax rate decreases as the base increases. |
| <u>J</u> 10. equalization | J. the method of state funding which involves calculation of the cost of a defined program, calculation of the amount of |
| <u>A</u> 11. policy | |
| <u>I</u> 12. regressive tax | |
| <u>D</u> 13. school building | |
| <u>G</u> 14. earmarked | |

funds that can be raised by a prescribed uniform local effort, and payment by the state of the part of the cost of the program that can not be met from the prescribed local effort.

- K. a tax whereby the tax rate remains constant whether the base increases or decreases.
- L. state funds that may be used for general school purposes without any restriction.
- M. generally an act of a professional member of the school board.
- N. a tax whereby the tax rate increases as the income or property base increases.

APPENDIX M

**ORAL REMARKS ABOUT WORKSHOP VOICED
BY WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS**

It is too bad workshops such as this one are not offered on a regular basis,

I learned more solid facts about being a board member tonight than I have since I was elected.

I enjoyed the program very much.

You have my congratulations on a highly informative program.

I wish the other members of our board could have been here this evening.

If you have more of these workshops, please let me know.

I did not realize there was so much to learn about being a board member.